













COPYRIGHT LAW

The copyright law of the United States (Title 17, United States Code) governs the making of photocopies or other reproductions of copyrighted material. Under certain conditions specified in the law, libraries and archives are authorized to furnish a photocopy or other reproduction. One of these specified conditions is that the photocopy or reproduction is for a purpose other than private study, scholarship, or research. If a user makes a request for, or later uses, a photocopy or reproduction for purposes in excess of "fair use," that user may be liable for copyright infringement. This institution has received a photocopying order if, in its judgment, fulfillment of the order would involve violation of copyright law.

THE GETTY CENTER: SETTING THE COURSE

Harold M. Williams

Interviewed by Richard Cándida Smith

RESTRICTIONS ON THIS INTERVIEW

This interview is sealed and will not be available for public access during the lifetime of Harold M. Williams.

LITERARY RIGHTS AND QUOTATION

Once the seal is lifted, this manuscript will be made available for research purposes only. All literary rights in the manuscript, including the right to publication, are reserved to the Getty Research Institute for the History of Art and the Humanities. No part of the manuscript may be reproduced without the written permission of the Assistant Director for Resource Collections of the Getty Research Institute for the History of Art and the Humanities.

Art History Oral Documentation Project

Compiled under the auspices
of the
Getty Research Institute for the
History of Art and the Humanities

Frontispiece: Harold M. Williams. Photograph by Cindy Anderson, courtesy of Harold M. Williams.

Copyright © 1999
The J. Paul Getty Trust



The 1 Paul Getty Trust

COPYRIGHT LAW

The copyright law of the United States (Title 17, United States Code) governs the making of photocopies or other reproductions of copyrighted material. Under certain conditions specified in the law, libraries and archives are authorized to furnish a photocopy or other reproduction. One of these specified conditions is that the photocopy or reproduction is not to be used for any purpose other than private study, scholarship, or research. If a user makes a request for, or later uses, a photocopy or reproduction for purposes in excess of "fair use," that user may be liable for copyright infringement. This institution reserves the right to refuse to accept a copying order if, in its judgment, fulfillment of the order would involve violation of copyright law.

RESTRICTIONS ON THIS INTERVIEW

This interview is sealed and will not be available for public access during the lifetime of Harold M. Williams.

LITERARY RIGHTS AND QUOTATION

Once the seal is lifted, this manuscript will be made available for research purposes only. All literary rights in the manuscript, including the right to publication, are reserved to the Getty Research Institute for the History of Art and the Humanities. No part of the manuscript may be quoted for publication without the written permission of the Assistant Director for Resource Collections of the Getty Research Institute for the History of Art and the Humanities.

* * *

Frontispiece: Harold M. Williams. Photograph by Cindy Anderson, courtesy of Harold M. Williams.



CONTENTS

Curriculum Vitae	xi
------------------------	----

SESSION ONE: 18 JUNE, 1997 (255 minutes)

TAPE I, SIDE ONE	1
------------------------	---

Father's work in insurance and accounting — Childhood spent in Boyle Heights district of Los Angeles — Neighborhood culturally mixed — Family Jewish but not religious — Parents' political alignment with the *Farband* — Attendance at Hebrew school — Yiddish culture at home and at school — Studying the cello as a child — A love of reading and many trips to the library — High school subject interests included physics — Majored in political science at the University of California at Los Angeles (UCLA) — Entered UCLA at sixteen and graduated in less than two-and-a-half years — Preference for economics — Ambition to become a lawyer surfaced in junior high school — Researched law firms before deciding to attend Harvard — Acquired practical accounting experience working on tax returns for his father's business — How Nuremberg trials affected Williams's decision to reject a career in criminal law — Focus changed to tax and corporate law — Exposure to art and culture during college years — Experienced anti-Semitism while searching for first job out of college — Drafted in 1950 — Experiences as a legal officer during the Korean War — Investigated war crimes against U.S. and South Korean troops — Emotional and philosophical impact of Korean War service — Return to previous job in law firm — Circumstances behind decision to leave the firm.

TAPE I, SIDE TWO	19
------------------------	----

Interviewing for a job with Norton Simon — On Simon's various business and cultural enterprises — Marriage to Estelle Feinstein — Children's careers and families — Williams's first involvement in politics in 1948, urging votes for Harry Truman — In Chicago as a Kennedy delegate in 1968 — Puts aside Democratic Party political work during Ronald Reagan's governorship — On Richard Nixon's



"enemies" list after contributing to George McGovern's campaign —
 Appointed chair of the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) by
 President Jimmy Carter — On being a Democrat — More on Harry
 Truman.

TAPE II, SIDE ONE 28

Circumstances leading to Williams's acceptance of the position of
 president and CEO of the Getty Museum — A prophetic meeting with
 Franklin Murphy — Offer from Harold Berg — Visiting museums and
 humanities institutions in preparation for the Getty position —
 Misconceptions in the field about the Getty's role in art market and its
 financial intentions — Disappointing search for "dreamers" — Hiring
 of Nancy Englander and Leilani Lattin Duke — Assessing needs and
 resources, visiting institutions worldwide, and interviewing leading
 scholars in preparation for development of an arts and humanities
 research center — Need to replace a number of original staff members
 — George Goldner's advancement to curator of drawings — On the
 Getty Oil Company and its leading figures — Problem of museum
 having too much stock in one company — Gordon Getty's ambitions
 — Necessity for restructuring the Getty Oil board — Composition of
 the J. Paul Getty Museum board of trustees.

TAPE II, SIDE TWO 47

Pennzoil's offer to buy 16 million shares of Getty Oil stock —
 Decision to sell to Texaco at a higher price — Sale and stock market
 surge in 1982 boosted Getty Museum's assets — Williams's role in
 handling the J. Paul Getty Trust's portfolio — Minimal effects of 1987
 stock market plunge — Comments on how vision for the Getty has
 changed since 1982 — Drawing on experiences at the SEC and at
 Norton Simon, Inc. — Introduced new approaches to management
 and decision-making while serving as dean and professor at UCLA's
 Graduate School of Management — Positive relationship with the
 Getty's board of trustees — Establishment of age and term limits —
 On the problem of overly involved museum board members —
 Requested resignation of Federico Zeri — Purpose and benefits of
 visiting committees.



TAPE III, SIDE ONE 61

More on hiring of Lani Duke— Process of developing a humanities center — Helpful suggestions from Franklin Murphy and Otto Wittmann — Building an advisory committee based on interviews in the U.S. and in Europe — Identifying institutional models here and abroad — Interest in developing a proactive rather than a passive arts and humanities research institute — Broadening goals for a conservation institute — Commitment to object oriented scientific research in the field of conservation — Art education program presented the greatest risk — More on the research institute's advisory committee — Search for a director for the Getty Center (now the Getty Research Institute for the History of Art and the Humanities)— First meetings with Kurt Forster — Necessity for enhancing administrative skills of heads of Getty programs — On the Getty budget process — Turnover viewed as positive — Commitment to keeping the library connected to the research institute — More on Kurt Forster.

TAPE III, SIDE TWO 80

On possibilities for competition and potential tensions between the various Getty programs — Differences envisioned as source of strength.

TAPE IV, SIDE ONE 81

More on relations between academic, museum, and managerial cultures within and outside of the Getty — Personality conflicts among the program directors — Proposals for establishment of programs in research, information, conservation, and education presented to the Getty board in 1982 — Search for new Getty site — Three properties considered — Brentwood site purchased in three parcels — On controversy over accessibility of Brentwood site and charges of elitism — Identifying new goals and establishing parameters in collecting for the J. Paul Getty Museum — Expanding into the areas of illuminated manuscripts, sculpture, drawings, and photography — Williams's role in acquisitions — On the auction process and the subjective nature of worth — Comments on the purchase of van Gogh's *Irises*.



SESSION TWO: 19 JUNE, 1997 (125 minutes)

TAPE V, SIDE ONE 97

Commitment to quality over quantity in collecting — Identifying gaps in the collections — The acquisition of Jacopo Pontormo's *Portrait of a Young Man* — Negotiating with British and French ministries of culture over purchases and export requirements — Questions of authenticity and provenance — On the controversy over the Getty kouros — Williams's aesthetic judgment and keen business sense aided in evaluation of potential purchases — Comparison of the Getty, Norton Simon, and Armand Hammer collections — Norton Simon's "eye for quality" — Exploring possibilities for acquiring the Norton Simon collection — Williams's role in the hiring of curators — Favorite Getty exhibits — Acquisition of the Lawrence and Barbara Fleischman collection — Changing priorities within the museum as the rate of acquiring new works declines — Changing operating procedures to eliminate possibilities for over-valuation and kickbacks to curators.

TAPE V, SIDE TWO 113

Williams discusses two reasons for de-accessioning — Questions the wisdom of spending money to store and maintain large numbers of inferior works — Speaking engagements and appointment to President's Committee on the Arts and Humanities — On the Getty Research Institute's collections of twentieth-century art — Need to limit purchases and focus on donations — On the importance of the Getty's collection of German Expressionist art — The Getty's visiting scholars program — Invitational approach versus competition — Difficulty of measuring the impact of the scholars program — Challenge of collective research projects — Kurt Forster's demanding schedule limited his interaction with visiting scholars — Williams's own availability to staff — Forster's resignation — On finding a successor — Salvatore Settis's directorship — More on necessity to carefully assess research institute's acquisition requests — Search for the first director of the Getty Conservation Institute — Accomplishments of Luis Monreal — Assessment of various Getty conservation projects.

THEORY OF THE EARTH

The theory of the earth is a branch of geology which deals with the origin and development of the earth and its various parts. It is a science which seeks to explain the processes which have shaped the earth and its features. The theory of the earth is based on the study of the earth's history and its various parts. It is a science which seeks to explain the processes which have shaped the earth and its features. The theory of the earth is based on the study of the earth's history and its various parts. It is a science which seeks to explain the processes which have shaped the earth and its features.

The theory of the earth is a branch of geology which deals with the origin and development of the earth and its various parts. It is a science which seeks to explain the processes which have shaped the earth and its features. The theory of the earth is based on the study of the earth's history and its various parts. It is a science which seeks to explain the processes which have shaped the earth and its features. The theory of the earth is based on the study of the earth's history and its various parts. It is a science which seeks to explain the processes which have shaped the earth and its features.

TAPE VI, SIDE ONE 132

More on conservation projects — Monreal's decision to leave the Getty — Miguel Angel Corzo chosen to succeed Monreal — On promoting from within the programs — Collaboration between various Getty institutes — On the Getty's involvement with public policy — Art History Information Program (AHIP, now the Getty Information Institute) projects: *RILA (International Repertory of the Literature of Art)*, and the *Avery Index* — Problems of leadership and lack of collaborative instinct within AHIP — Accomplishments of Eleanor Fink — Initiation of Object ID project.

SESSION THREE: 20 JUNE, 1997 (115 minutes)

TAPE VII, SIDE ONE 143

Conceptions of the new Getty Center — Process of selecting an architect — Richard Meier's qualifications — Visits to museums and research centers in Europe — Disagreements over the character of the landscaping — Robert Irwin brought in to design the gardens — More on selection of Richard Meier over other architects — his impressive commitment to the project — Meier's quality of design and attention to detail carried through in the construction phase — Problem of perfectionism and "never getting rid of your architect" — Comments on work of Frank Gehry and Peter Eisenman — City imposed 107 use restrictions on the Getty Center project — Neighbors' concerns — On the question of office space and expansion — More on ideas gleaned from looking at other museums and institutes — Measures to reduce fire hazard at the Getty Center — Involvement of various school districts in the Getty's art education program — Los Angeles Unified School District the last to join — The struggle to convey the importance of art education as an essential component in intellectual growth — More on Williams's activities on the President's Committee on the Arts and the Humanities — Early confusions about Getty grants.

TAPE VII, SIDE TWO 162

Deborah Marrow and the Getty Grant Program — The practice of



actively shaping grants as opposed to just doling out money — Grant projects in Los Angeles — Institute directors largely free to pursue their own initiatives — Williams offers suggestions and challenges their thinking — Working with the potential problem of self-satisfaction within the Getty — The development of the Getty Leadership Institute — More on the Getty's role in affecting public policy in the arts — Williams's membership in the Public Policy Institute of California — Sensing opportunities for constructive intervention — More on Williams's tenure as Chairman of the SEC — Efforts to make corporations more accountable for their business practices — On avoiding an "ivory tower" attitude within the Getty — Englander's resignation seen as a serious loss to the Getty — More on her contributions and talents — On the necessity for challenges from within — The value of constructive criticism — Thomas Hoving's attacks on the Getty — The Getty's role in helping to shape a post-cold war world — Travels to East Germany, a meeting with Chancellor Helmut Kohl, and the collapse of the Berlin wall — Further travels to Eastern Europe revealed the extent of cultural isolation there — Getty Grant Program projects in Czechoslovakia, Poland, and Hungary — Conservation projects in St. Petersburg and Prague.

TAPE VIII, SIDE ONE 179

Getty projects in Latin America — Scholarly exchanges and conservation training — Reaction to the 1992 civil disturbance in Los Angeles — Challenge of building community from all of the "ethnic enclaves" of Los Angeles — Tendency for institutions to slice up and marginalize ethnic cultures — On Proposition 209 — Affirmative action within the Getty — Staff volunteers in inner city schools — Williams's strong support for the National Endowment for the Arts (NEA) — Necessity for the government to acknowledge the importance of the arts — Lack of a strategic campaign to ensure the survival of the NEA — Williams's retirement plans include involvement in art education projects.

Index 189

Richard Cándida Smith, Associate Professor of American History and Director of the Program in American Culture at the University of



Michigan, interviewed Harold Williams in his office at the Getty Center in Los Angeles, California. A total of 8.25 hours were recorded. The transcript was edited by Katherine P. Smith.



CURRICULUM VITAE

Harold M. Williams

DATE OF BIRTH: January 5, 1928

BIRTHPLACE: Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

PROFESSIONAL CAREER:

Harold M. Williams is Of Counsel, to the law firm of Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meagher & Flom. He is also President Emeritus of the J. Paul Getty Trust, Los Angeles, California, a charitable trust devoted to the arts and humanities, with an endowment in excess of \$5.1 billion. He was President and Chief Executive Officer of the Trust from May 1981 until January 1998. Under his leadership, six operating programs and a grant program were established, dedicated to the visual arts and humanities, and the Getty Center in Los Angeles was created. Through its activities and through collaborative projects with institutions around the world, the Trust seeks to make a significant contribution to the vitality of the visual arts in the areas of conservation, scholarship, and education. The six operating programs are:

- The J. Paul Getty Museum
- The Getty Research Institute for the History of Art and the Humanities
- The Getty Conservation Institute
- The Getty Information Institute
- The Getty Education Institute for the Arts
- The Getty Leadership Institute for Museum Management

Prior to assuming his position within the Trust in May, 1981, Mr Williams served approximately four years as Chairman of the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission, Washington D. C., having been nominated to that position in 1977 by President Carter. During his tenure as the Commission's Chairman, Mr Williams received considerable attention for his views advocating the necessity of accountable conduct by the business community, particularly of boards of directors, and the importance of regulatory self-restraint by government.

From July 1, 1970, until his appointment to the Commission by President Carter, Mr. Williams served as Dean and Professor of Management of the Graduate School of Management, University of California, Los Angeles. During his administration, the school achieved ranking within the top ten graduate business and management schools in the U. S., including recognition as the leading graduate business school in a



public university.

Mr. Williams joined Hunt Foods and Industries, Inc., in 1955 as Associate Tax Counsel. He subsequently became Tax Counsel, Vice President for Finance, and Executive Vice President. In 1964, he became president of Hunt-Wesson Foods, Inc. In 1968, he was elected President of Hunt Foods and Industries, Inc., and with the formation of Norton Simon, Inc., later that year—resulting from the consolidation of Canada Dry Corporation, Hunt Foods and Industries, Inc., and McCall Corporation—he was named chairman of the new company's Finance Committee. In 1969, he assumed the additional post of Chairman of the Board of Norton Simon, Inc.

Mr. Williams joined a Los Angeles law firm in 1949, where he specialized in tax and corporation law and remained until 1955, except for service as a U. S. army officer during the Korean emergency, during which he was awarded the Bronze Star.

EDUCATION:

Mr. Williams received his B.A. from UCLA, graduating Phi Beta Kappa. Three years later he was awarded his J.D. degree from Harvard University Law School.

HONORS (RECENT):

- Doctor of Humane Letters degrees from Johns Hopkins University, Occidental College, and California State University, Northridge
- Appointment by President Clinton as member of the President's Committee on the Arts and the Humanities
- Honored by the French government as *Officier dans L'Ordre des Arts et des Lettres*

CURRENT AFFILIATIONS:

- President's Committee on the Arts and the Humanities
- Director, Los Angeles Philharmonic Association
- Director, The California Endowment
- Member, Commission on the Academic Presidency
- Co-Chair, California Citizens Commission on the Future of Higher Education
- Chair, Committee for Effective School Governance
- Director, Los Angeles Annenberg Metropolitan Project
- Chair, UCLA School of the Arts and Architecture Board of Visitors
- Co-Chair, Blue Ribbon Committee for Arts Education, LAUSD

The first part of the paper discusses the importance of the study of the history of the United States. It is argued that the study of the history of the United States is essential for a full understanding of the country and its people. The second part of the paper discusses the importance of the study of the history of the United States. It is argued that the study of the history of the United States is essential for a full understanding of the country and its people.

The third part of the paper discusses the importance of the study of the history of the United States. It is argued that the study of the history of the United States is essential for a full understanding of the country and its people. The fourth part of the paper discusses the importance of the study of the history of the United States. It is argued that the study of the history of the United States is essential for a full understanding of the country and its people.

The fifth part of the paper discusses the importance of the study of the history of the United States. It is argued that the study of the history of the United States is essential for a full understanding of the country and its people. The sixth part of the paper discusses the importance of the study of the history of the United States. It is argued that the study of the history of the United States is essential for a full understanding of the country and its people.

- Director, Public Policy Institute of California

In March, 1994, Mr. Williams completed a twelve year term as member of the Board of Regents of the University of California.

Mr. Williams served full time as Energy Coordinator for the City of Los Angeles during the 1973-74 energy crisis. In his service to the community, Mr. Williams served as Co-Chairman for the Public Commission on Los Angeles County Government; a subcommittee chairman of the Mayor's ad hoc Committee on Los Angeles City Revenues; a member of the State of California Commission on Tort Reform; and a member of the SEC Advisory Committee on Corporate Disclosure.



SESSION ONE: 18 JUNE, 1997

[Tape I, Side One]

SMITH: Let's start with where and when you were born.

WILLIAMS: I was born in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, on January 5, 1928.

SMITH: But you grew up in Los Angeles, as I recall.

WILLIAMS: I came to Los Angeles just after my sixth birthday, and I've lived here ever since, except for three tours of duty elsewhere.

SMITH: What did your parents do?

WILLIAMS: Well, my mother [Sophie] was in today's parlance a homemaker, and my father's work varied in my lifetime. He [Louis] had a real estate and insurance business in Philadelphia that went belly-up during the depression. When we came out here he did everything from selling insurance door to door, to working as an accountant in a furniture factory, to building his own accounting practice and insurance business. He sold his accounting practice when his eyesight began to go bad, but he continued his own modest insurance business until he died.

SMITH: Did he have a college education?

WILLIAMS: No, nor a high school education for that matter.

SMITH: Was he born in the U.S?

WILLIAMS: Both my parents were born in Russia.

SMITH: Did they meet in Russia?



WILLIAMS: No, they both came to the United States as teenagers and met here, in Philadelphia.

SMITH: As I understand, you grew up in the Boyle Heights area. What kind of neighborhood was that back then in the thirties and forties?

WILLIAMS: Well, we didn't know the term "multicultural," but it sure was. It was a very mixed neighborhood. You might say at that time it was the predominant Jewish neighborhood, as far as Jewish communities go. It was not the neighborhood of the well-to-do Jews, let me put it that way. It was also heavily Mexican. We never knew the term Hispanic at that time. It was Mexican, Russian, Armenian, Japanese. There were a few blacks, but not many, and a smattering of everything else. One of my good friends was Dutch. My closest friends early on were Jewish and Japanese. And then the Japanese were evacuated, to use a polite term. One of my first girlfriends was Mexican.

It was a very mixed neighborhood, very multicultural, and there wasn't any obvious bigotry or bias going on. In fact, we celebrated all the holidays at school, and all the festivals, whatever religion or nationality. I think that that in some way is partly why I feel as I do about the importance of bridging these cultures.

SMITH: Was it considered a tough neighborhood back then?

WILLIAMS: Yes, it had *some* toughness. I still have a knife scar to show for it. I wouldn't say it was a tough neighborhood, but there were some toughs around. Most



of them were Mexican, at the time. You're too young to remember, but the Zoot Suit riots of World War II all started in that area. But I walked to school, I walked to all my after-school activities; in many instances it was a couple of miles, and often it was after dark. I was never concerned about it. It wasn't the kind of neighborhood one would characterize as tough today, where you're almost afraid to go out; there was never any of that kind of fear. Occasionally, you bumped into a problem.

SMITH: Was your family practicing? Did they go to temple on a regular basis?

WILLIAMS: No, my parents were not at all religious. They were very Jewish. We spoke Yiddish at home. In fact, when my brother started school he didn't speak English. He was twelve years older than I am. My parents didn't make the same mistake with me. We were very concerned about Jewish issues, very aware of Jewish literature. We celebrated all the Jewish holidays, but religion wasn't a part of it. It's interesting, there were different strains within the Jewish community; it ran the whole spectrum from religious Jews at one end to what were considered to be the real leftists at the other. My parents didn't have any use for either end. I think they were socialists, basically.

SMITH: Were they in the Arbeiter Ring?

WILLIAMS: No, the Arbeiter Ring were the leftists as far as my parents were concerned. They were part of what was called the *Farband*, the Jewish National Workers' Alliance. I went to Hebrew school, and, again, religion wasn't a big part of

1. The first part of the document discusses the importance of maintaining accurate records of all transactions and activities. It emphasizes the need for transparency and accountability in financial reporting.

2. The second part of the document outlines the various methods and techniques used to collect and analyze data. It includes a detailed description of the experimental procedures and the statistical analysis performed.

3. The third part of the document presents the results of the study. It includes a series of tables and graphs that illustrate the findings of the research. The data shows a clear trend of increasing activity over time.

4. The fourth part of the document discusses the implications of the findings. It suggests that the results have significant implications for the field of study and may lead to further research in this area.

5. The fifth part of the document concludes the study. It summarizes the main findings and provides a final statement on the importance of the research.

it. We read the Old Testament in Hebrew, and we translated it into Yiddish. We read Yiddish literature. We had our own kind of Bar Mitzvah ceremony, which consisted of my translating a portion out of the Old Testament into Yiddish, reciting it in Hebrew and Yiddish from memory, and writing my own commentary on it, which was delivered in Yiddish. But as far as religion was concerned, my father and I attended services twice in our joint lifetime, that's all. Once, when a famous cantor was in town, we went to the old Mount Sinai temple on New Hampshire Street to listen to him, and the second time was on Yom Kippur, about two weeks before my father passed away. I had joined a temple, and my mother had passed away, my father was out visiting with us, and we went to Yom Kippur services together; that was the extent of our religious involvement.

SMITH: What about a sense of culture—literature, art, and music—in your household? Were you introduced to the European classics as a child and teenager?

WILLIAMS: No, no. Through discussion at home, and also through my Hebrew school, I was introduced to Yiddish classics—Sholem Aleichem, and a number of the other writers of Eastern Europe. I played the cello as a child. I enjoyed it and did pretty well with it. I was second chair of the all city orchestra that existed at the time. I got away from it when I went to college. I still have my cello, but I never went back to playing it. I love music. Art was not part of my life. There wasn't any here. *Pinky* and *The Blue Boy* were at the Huntington [Library], and I went there several times,

1. The first part of the paper discusses the importance of maintaining accurate records of all transactions and the role of the auditor in this regard. It highlights the need for transparency and accountability in financial reporting.

2. The second part of the paper examines the various methods used to collect and analyze data, including interviews, surveys, and document analysis. It emphasizes the importance of using a mix of methods to ensure the reliability and validity of the findings.

3. The third part of the paper presents the results of the study, which show that there is a significant gap between the current state of financial reporting and the best practices identified in the literature. It also identifies the key factors that contribute to this gap, such as lack of resources, training, and oversight.

4. The fourth part of the paper discusses the implications of the findings for practice and policy. It suggests that there is a need for more robust oversight and monitoring of financial reporting, as well as increased training and support for those responsible for preparing and reviewing financial statements.

5. The final part of the paper concludes with a summary of the key findings and a call to action for the accounting profession and regulatory bodies to work together to improve the quality and integrity of financial reporting.

but that was all the art there was; art didn't come into my life until I went east to law school.

My parents believed in education as the key to a better life. My mother took me to the library from the time I was six years old, and I always took out books. For a long time they were primarily picture books. I read *National Geographic* for years; I started with the pictures more than anything else. But I became a voracious reader, and always have been. My reading included classics—everything. As a child, I read all of Zane Grey, and Agatha Christie, a lot of kids authors, all of Jack London's stuff. I just read. Everything.

SMITH: As I recall, you went to UCLA [University of California at Los Angeles] when you were sixteen years old. What were your favorite subjects in high school?

WILLIAMS: I'm not sure I had any favorite subjects. I don't really recall any favorites. A group of us went to UCLA; there were probably a dozen out of my graduating class, and I was the only one who was not a member of the honorary society in high school, the Ephebian Society, or whatever it was called. I turned on to some subjects. In my physics class, my term paper was on television—the more technical side of it. That's because it seemed to me at that time that this was something that was really developing. I did an enormous amount of research and wrote a very complex paper on it. I don't know how accurate it was, but I got a good grade. I don't recall any subjects that really turned me on. I debated in high school. I



was not a great student; I was okay, good enough to get into UCLA. And yet, of that whole group that went in and took the Subject A exam, I was the only one that passed. So, I don't know how to rationalize all that.

SMITH: What high school did you go to?

WILLIAMS: Roosevelt. Yes, I was just sixteen when I started at UCLA, in February of '44.

SMITH: Were your parents directing you in any sort of profession or career?

WILLIAMS: No, although in a very fundamental sense, yes. There was never any question that I was going to go to college and be a professional, even though there wasn't the financial wherewithal to do it. This expectation was kind of disconnected from reality, but education was it as far as my family was concerned.

SMITH: But the UC system at that time was very inexpensive.

WILLIAMS: Well, UCLA made it possible. If it hadn't been for UCLA, I don't know what my life would be today, because, literally, there was no money. We came to Los Angeles initially because the only scholarship my brother got to go to college was from USC [University of Southern California]. There was absolutely no money in '44 for my parents to pay for college. I had been working and I had a little money, but it was nothing by comparison to what I would have needed even then at a private institution. So that's one of the reasons I feel as passionately as I do about maintaining the openness of access to the University of California.



SMITH: The other thing I recall is that you completed your undergraduate college education in two or two-and-a-half years?

WILLIAMS: Two years and four months. Basically, I went to school year round, which was possible during the war, and I took more than the normal number of units.

SMITH: What was your major?

WILLIAMS: That's a good question. Officially, my major was political science, but I had enough units in economics to have been an economics major as well.

SMITH: If you just look at it from the outside, going to college at sixteen and graduating in two-and-a-half years would indicate that you were some kind of *wunderkind*, but I think that when we talked about this earlier you disputed that.

WILLIAMS: I didn't have any feeling of that. I was Phi Beta Kappa when I graduated, which I think meant more then than it does now. I was proud of it. But also I worked, I played basketball, I debated in college, and I lived at home, so getting to UCLA and back was two to three hours a day, by public transportation, or with a friend who had a car. I didn't have a car. I don't know. When I look back on it, I crammed a lot in. But I never felt there was anything exceptional about it.

SMITH: Are there any teachers at UCLA who were particularly important to you?

WILLIAMS: It's strange. The answer, again, is not many. Maybe it's just because it was a long time ago. I was somewhat taken with Professor Grant—J. A. C. Grant. I took both constitutional law and administrative law from him, although, I didn't do

1. The first part of the document discusses the importance of maintaining accurate records of all transactions and activities. It emphasizes the need for transparency and accountability in financial reporting.

2. The second part of the document outlines the various methods and techniques used to collect and analyze data. It includes a detailed description of the experimental procedures and the statistical analysis performed.

3. The third part of the document presents the results of the study. It includes a series of tables and graphs that illustrate the findings of the research. The data shows a clear trend of increasing activity over time.

4. The fourth part of the document discusses the implications of the findings. It suggests that the results have significant implications for the field of research and may lead to further developments in the future.

5. The fifth part of the document concludes the study. It summarizes the main findings and provides a final statement on the importance of the research.

that well in the courses. Other than that, there were a number of teachers whom I really enjoyed, but it was more the content of the courses that interested me. I got a kick out of reading and translating Ovid's *Metamorphoses* from Latin. I couldn't do it today. I took a lot of psychology, which I enjoyed. I enjoyed economics much more than political science. I can remember names of courses and names of authors more than I can names of professors. I don't know what that tells you.

SMITH: So, when you graduate you are eighteen years old, and it's 1946, so the war's over.

WILLIAMS: Right.

SMITH: What were the options for you in terms of what you could do then?

WILLIAMS: To me the only option was where I went to law school.

SMITH: So you already knew you were going to be a lawyer?

WILLIAMS: From junior high school on. At one time I was going to be a journalist, and even carried that far enough to know where the good journalism schools were, but I got away from that and decided to become a lawyer, and that stuck with me. So it was a matter of where I'd be admitted and what I could handle financially. I applied all over hell and gone. I didn't apply to Berkeley. I applied to USC, the University of Chicago, the University of Michigan, Harvard, Yale, and Columbia, and I got admitted to all of them. I picked Harvard. USC was a fall-back position if I had to live at home.



SMITH: Was there any particular reason for going to Harvard?

WILLIAMS: Yes. I went to a number of the leading law firms in town, and said, "Here's where I've been admitted, where should I go?" I didn't have any contacts, and I didn't have a practice to step into, or a clientele, so I needed the cachet. So I went around to find out where the cachet lay. And, unanimously, the recommendation was that I go to Harvard. My father was doing a little better by then, and we had agreed that my parents could provide a certain amount of money per month, which wasn't enough, but I could get by on it.

SMITH: What kind of focus did you develop for yourself while you were in law school?

WILLIAMS: Before I went to law school, a good part of the work I did was with my father in the accounting end of the business, and from the time I was twelve years old I worked on tax returns with him. The time leading up to March 15 was hectic—it was then March 15, not April 15. I prepared tax returns, worked on return schedules and so forth. So that was very much a part of my life. At UCLA I took every accounting course they offered. In fact, I took a tax accounting course and the final required that I prepare a return, which I did, and I got a B in the course. I couldn't understand that. I went to see the professor, and we went over my final together. I had deducted an item at a different place on the return from where he felt it should be taken out. I said, "But I've been doing this for years. We've been filing returns, and



we've never had a problem." Well, he said it was wrong. When I became dean of the business school he was still there, and I reminded him of that discussion.

I remember my uncle, my father's brother, asking me what my aspiration was. I said I wanted to be a criminal lawyer, a defense lawyer, and my aspiration was to make \$25,000 a year practicing law. At that time that was a fair amount of money. I was single-minded about wanting to be a defense lawyer, and it never occurred to me until my third year that my field was really tax law and corporate law. My first semester I took a required course in criminal law. I always believed in the right of the accused to a good defense. But I began to get a little jaundiced about some of the things that were being done to defend people.

One of the clinchers was that I got into a terrible argument with my law school professor, at the time of the Nuremberg trials. We spent a fair amount of time talking about the war crimes trials. My professor was very much in favor of them, and in principle I was too, but I said I thought the Nuremberg trials were legitimizing the right of the victor to prosecute the vanquished, and that troubled me. He couldn't see that, and we argued about it extensively. Why that turned me off on criminal law, I'm not sure, but in part it did. I guess I felt that the people involved in criminal law tended to get so focused on defending the individual that they lost sight of the larger reason for the law. So I pretty well decided I wasn't going to become a criminal lawyer. I did well in the business law courses and in the tax law course. I did well in



some of the other courses, but I nearly flunked bankruptcy law, for reasons I never could understand.

SMITH: You said that when you were at Harvard you got exposed to a lot more in terms of art and culture. Was this an important part of your life at that time?

WILLIAMS: It became important. My uncle lived in New York and I'd visit there quite often and spend a lot of time at the Museum of Modern Art, and the Metropolitan Museum [of Art]. It was a whole new world for me. I also visited the Boston Museum of Fine Arts. There was the Boston Symphony during the winter and the [Boston] Pops orchestra during the summer. I went home the first summer, but the second summer I stayed in Boston. Actually, in my last year at Harvard I probably spent more time sitting in on undergraduate art history classes at the college than at the law school. And I worked. I didn't have a year round full-time job, but I worked the tax season extensively, to make some money. I was not an outstanding student in law school; I was a B student.

SMITH: When you finished, were you planning to come back to Los Angeles?

WILLIAMS: Yes, and I did. I had always planned to come back to LA.

SMITH: Now, you had a stint of military service.

WILLIAMS: That came later, after I came back to LA.

SMITH: When did you graduate from law school?

WILLIAMS: '49.

1. The first part of the document discusses the importance of maintaining accurate records of all transactions and activities. It emphasizes the need for transparency and accountability in financial reporting.

2. The second part of the document outlines the various methods and techniques used to collect and analyze data. It includes a detailed description of the experimental procedures and the statistical analysis performed.

3. The third part of the document presents the results of the study. It includes a series of tables and graphs that illustrate the findings of the research. The data shows a clear trend of increasing activity over time.

4. The fourth part of the document discusses the implications of the findings. It suggests that the results have significant implications for the field of study and may lead to further research in this area.

5. The fifth part of the document concludes the study. It summarizes the key findings and provides a final statement on the importance of the research.

SMITH: So you started looking for a job. Where were you looking at that time?

WILLIAMS: Anyplace. It was tough. It wasn't an easy time to find a job. I went through a long series of interviews with O'Melveny and Myers, one of the big firms. Back at that time it was one of the two leading gentile firms in town. I got a clue about what was going on when I was downtown, between interviews or something, and I ran into my old high school principal, Francis X. Doherty. He recognized me and I obviously did him, and we chatted. He said, "Somebody was talking to me recently about you." And I said, "Oh, yes, it was Maynard [J.] Toll." Well, Maynard Toll was one of the recruiting partners at O'Melveny and he had been on the board of education for a number of years. Toll apparently had called Doherty, in effect, to find out what kind of kid I was, and what kind of Jew I was. Shortly thereafter, Toll told me that they were only hiring one person that year, and that they would not be hiring me. But as it turned out the issue was, were they ready to hire their first Jew.

SMITH: And they weren't.

WILLIAMS: They weren't. The one person they hired was Warren Christopher.

SMITH: Oh.

WILLIAMS: So, on an absolute scale, leaving Jewishness aside, that's not a bad person to be second to.

SMITH: But still, Los Angeles has a history of a lot of anti-Semitism, particularly in this period.



WILLIAMS: Yes, it began to break down soon after, because I think it was two years later they did hire their first Jewish associate.

SMITH: In fact, the restrictive covenants are thrown out in '47.

WILLIAMS: Yes, they were thrown out by then, or somewhere around in there. So then I got an offer from two nice guys. It was a personal injury firm. They offered me I think \$450 a month. I didn't want to do personal injury work. I recommended they look at a friend of mine who had graduated with me. He took the job and did very well there, extremely well. I finally got an offer from a one-man firm named Charles H. Carr at \$225 a month, which I took because it was tax and corporate law. It was a great learning experience for me.

SMITH: Did you continue living at home then?

WILLIAMS: I was living at home then, yes. I couldn't afford it otherwise. Of course, that didn't last too long. I guess in, I don't know, September of '49, I passed the bar, and then in the middle of the following year came the Korean War, and it was in September of '50 that I was drafted. So I was there roughly a year, but I came back to the firm after I got out of the service.

SMITH: In the military you served in the legal corps?

WILLIAMS: I went through basic training as a private. This was at Fort Ord. The judge advocate learned of my presence there, and when I finished basic training he asked for me and I came over, as a private, into his office. I was promoted there



several times. He had talked to me about prospects for being commissioned. He urged me to complete the application, because he was going to go back to Washington on business and he would take it back. In July of '51, on the same day that my orders came through promoting me to sergeant, my orders came through appointing me to first lieutenant in the Judge Advocate General Corps. I was the first person commissioned as a judge advocate in the Korean War. They actually made a mistake, which they tried to change later and I wouldn't let them. A number of reserve officers who were judge advocate officers were called up for twenty-one months. They commissioned me in the reserve and called me up for twenty-one months too, but what they should have done, and what they did with others that they commissioned afterwards was make it a three-year commission, not a reserve commission, called up. They tried to change mine, saying they'd made a mistake. I said, "I accepted on those terms. You can't change it now." So I was called up for twenty-one months. It was in October of '51 that I was ordered to the Far East.

SMITH: And you were doing military criminal law?

WILLIAMS: In the States I was doing other kinds of legal work. I didn't do any trial work in the States. But I had different assignments in the Far East. I went over as what they call a casual officer, which meant that I was traveling alone, I was not part of a unit. I was first assigned to what was called Headquarters, Northern Command, which was based in Sendai, and there I started off doing criminal defense work. No.

1. The first part of the document discusses the importance of maintaining accurate records of all transactions and activities. It emphasizes the need for transparency and accountability in financial reporting.

2. The second part outlines the various methods used to collect and analyze data, including surveys, interviews, and focus groups. It also describes the statistical techniques employed to interpret the results.

3. The third part presents the findings of the study, highlighting the key trends and patterns observed. It includes a detailed analysis of the data and a discussion of the implications for future research.

4. The fourth part concludes the document by summarizing the main points and providing recommendations for further action. It also includes a list of references and a bibliography.

5. The fifth part contains a list of appendices, which provide additional information and data related to the study. These include raw data, detailed calculations, and supplementary figures.

6. The sixth part is a list of figures and tables, which are used to present the data in a more visual and accessible format. These include line graphs, bar charts, and tables of data.

7. The seventh part is a list of references, which cite the sources of information used in the study. These include books, articles, and other published works.

8. The eighth part is a list of appendices, which provide additional information and data related to the study. These include raw data, detailed calculations, and supplementary figures.

9. The ninth part is a list of figures and tables, which are used to present the data in a more visual and accessible format. These include line graphs, bar charts, and tables of data.

10. The tenth part is a list of references, which cite the sources of information used in the study. These include books, articles, and other published works.

I started off there doing prosecution. Then, in December, the First Cavalry Division got cut up very badly by the Chinese when they came in. I was sent over to Korea with the First Cavalry and came back to Japan with them when they were pulled out.

I spent a number of months there prosecuting individuals who had been charged with cowardice. Then I went back to Sendai, to Northern Command, and became the administrative officer of the unit there. When General [Haydon] Boatner was captured on Kojé—he went down to the Chinese prisoner camp and got captured there—they were going to send a unit in to free him, and they wanted a legal officer. For some reason they sent me over. So I went in with the troops that released Boatner. From there I went back to Northern Command, and then I requested transfer to Korea. I figured as long as I was there I might as well find out what the hell it was all about. So I went over and was attached to the War Crimes Commission, which was part of the Eighth Army. It sounds kind of crazy to me to have a War Crimes Commission, but anyway, we had one.

SMITH: Directed towards Chinese and North Korean troops?

WILLIAMS: Yes, atrocities being committed against U.S. and south Korean troops—or the other troops that were part of the coalition. Then I was made chief of the Apprehension and Investigation section. As we recaptured or released American soldiers, sometimes we'd get a report saying, for example, "I was only fed two rice balls a day." Then we'd ask, "What did the Chinese guards get to eat?" If the reply

1. The first part of the document discusses the importance of maintaining accurate records of all transactions and activities. It emphasizes the need for transparency and accountability in financial reporting.

2. The second part of the document outlines the various methods and techniques used to collect and analyze data. It includes a detailed description of the experimental procedures and the statistical analysis performed.

3. The third part of the document presents the results of the study. It includes a series of tables and graphs that illustrate the findings of the research. The data shows a clear trend of increasing activity over time.

4. The fourth part of the document discusses the implications of the findings. It suggests that the results have significant implications for the field of study and may lead to further research in this area.

5. The fifth part of the document concludes the study. It summarizes the main findings and provides a final statement on the importance of the research.

was, "Two rice balls a day," I'd sign it off as no war crime. My command didn't like that. So I was relieved of my duties with the War Crimes Commission. Then I was assigned to what we called the Eighth Army Traveling Court. Another lawyer and I would travel to outlying places in Korea by jeep to prosecute or defend general court martial. We alternated prosecuting and defending, but I usually prosecuted on those cases.

Then I was transferred, again at my request, to the Third Infantry Division, which was in the line. They'd had problems with the Sixty-Fifth Regiment, which was Puerto Rican. I went in to defend Puerto Ricans who were charged with cowardice. Actually, in the course of that, I went out on patrol a couple of times to see what the conditions were that they were encountering, and I did a pretty good job of defending them. They were all convicted. I didn't get anybody acquitted, but they got three-month or six-month sentences, or bad conduct discharges; at least they didn't get fifty years, which was not uncommon. When they pulled the Third Infantry out of the line, I went back with them, my tour was up, and I came home.

SMITH: And you went back to work at the same law firm?

WILLIAMS: Yes.

SMITH: Maybe you could describe a little bit how you came to work for Norton Simon.

WILLIAMS: It was a combination of two things. I didn't realize it at the time, but as

1. The first part of the document discusses the importance of maintaining accurate records of all transactions and activities. It emphasizes the need for transparency and accountability in financial reporting.

2. The second part of the document outlines the various methods and techniques used to collect and analyze data. It includes a detailed description of the experimental procedures and the statistical analysis performed.

3. The third part of the document presents the results of the study. It includes a series of tables and graphs that illustrate the findings of the research. The data shows a clear trend of increasing values over time.

4. The final part of the document discusses the implications of the findings and provides recommendations for future research. It suggests that further studies should be conducted to explore the underlying causes of the observed trends.

I've thought back, Korea had a pretty profound impact on me. I still don't know how to describe it, I'm not enough of a philosopher to, but it made a fatalist or an existentialist out of me in many ways. It exposed me to risk, which I survived, and to some extent it was risk I asked for; it was not just imposed on me. I think I acquired a kind of maturity that was important.

I came back to work for the firm. I was married at this point and had a son. The firm was a great experience for me as a lawyer. My boss was very bright, a good business getter with a lot of Irish charm. He was a good-looking, red-headed guy, he had been a U.S. attorney, he was a good politician, but he was as lazy as could be. The consequence was that I was thrown into all kinds of things. Nobody was teaching me, really, but there was an opportunity to learn. I remember the first day I came into work, before I went into the service, I was assigned to negotiate a series of leases between a motion picture company and the owner of a bunch of theaters. I'd never negotiated a lease, I didn't know what a lease looked like. That was the beginning.

One of the cases that came into the office was a tax fraud charge against Wilbur Clark, who at that time was kind of the front man for the Desert Inn in Las Vegas. There was a theory of prosecution at that time called net worth reconstruction: if you could show that so-and-so had a net worth of x at the beginning of the period and y at the end of the period, and the tax return filed didn't

1. The first part of the document discusses the importance of maintaining accurate records of all transactions and activities. It emphasizes the need for transparency and accountability in financial reporting.

2. The second part outlines the various methods used to collect and analyze data, including surveys, interviews, and focus groups. It also describes the statistical techniques employed to interpret the results.

3. The third part presents the findings of the study, highlighting the key trends and patterns observed. It includes a detailed analysis of the data and discusses the implications for future research and practice.

4. The fourth part concludes the document by summarizing the main points and providing recommendations for further action. It also includes a list of references and a bibliography.

5. The fifth part contains a list of appendices, which provide additional information and data related to the study. These include raw data, detailed calculations, and supplementary figures.

6. The sixth part is a list of figures and tables, which are used to present the data in a more visual and accessible format. These include line graphs, bar charts, and tables of data.

7. The seventh part is a list of footnotes, which provide additional information and references for the data and figures presented in the document.

8. The eighth part is a list of references, which provide a comprehensive overview of the literature and research used in the study.

9. The ninth part is a list of appendices, which provide additional information and data related to the study. These include raw data, detailed calculations, and supplementary figures.

10. The tenth part is a list of figures and tables, which are used to present the data in a more visual and accessible format. These include line graphs, bar charts, and tables of data.

show the kind of income that would have justified that increase, the government could construct a prima facie case of tax fraud, and it was incumbent then upon the defense to come forward and prove that it wasn't. I was assigned the preparation and the investigation of the case. I spent days in Vegas, interviewing people, many of whom I later learned, or learned in the process, were in the gambling underworld. Some people didn't want to talk, and others gave me fuzzy answers. The bank where Wilbur did all his banking had had a fire, and some of the records for the period involved were gone. Those that existed were scattered in an attic, and they were an absolute jumble. I spent days up there.

I was able to reconstruct that Wilbur undoubtedly had money that he couldn't account for, but that he had in effect received it in an earlier year, not the year of the charge. I could build up the case that Wilbur was patriotic, he bought U.S. government bonds and all, and I was able to reconstruct his net worth to show that the government's starting net worth was wrong, that it was higher at the start of the period than they claimed, and therefore it reconciled with the net worth at the end of the period, so they had the wrong year. Not that he was innocent, but they had the wrong year. Well, we went to trial and Wilbur was acquitted. We came back to our office—Wilbur and his accountant and his regular lawyer, my boss, and me. This was mid-day, and my boss broke out a bottle of whisky; we were all having a drink and celebrating. Another quality of my boss's which I didn't mention was he was very

1. The first part of the paper discusses the importance of understanding the underlying mechanisms of the observed phenomena. This is crucial for developing effective interventions and policies. The authors argue that a comprehensive understanding of the system is necessary to address the complex challenges it presents.

2. The second part of the paper focuses on the methodology used in the study. The authors describe the data collection process, the statistical models employed, and the validation techniques used to ensure the reliability of the results. They emphasize the importance of transparency and reproducibility in scientific research.

3. The third part of the paper presents the results of the study. The authors show that the proposed model accurately captures the dynamics of the system, providing valuable insights into its behavior. They also discuss the implications of these findings for future research and practical applications.

4. The final part of the paper concludes with a summary of the key findings and a discussion of the limitations of the study. The authors acknowledge that while the model provides a useful approximation, it may not fully capture all aspects of the system's complexity. They suggest areas for further research to refine the model and explore its potential applications in greater detail.

insecure. The next thing I know I'm getting a lecture on trial preparation in front of Wilbur and the others.

[Tape I, Side Two]

WILLIAMS: My boss in his own way was having to justify to his client the enormous fee that he was getting for the representation. Well, it really pissed me off. I walked out of the office, and his secretary, who could hear through the wall what was going on in there, said, "Hal, you might be interested in this," and she showed me a blind ad in the *Wall Street Journal* for an associate tax counsel. I'd never answered an ad in the *Wall Street Journal*. I went back to my office and dictated a response. Six months later I was working for Norton Simon.

SMITH: Was there anything special about the interview process, how you got selected?

WILLIAMS: I guess there were two things special about it . . . three things. One is, the more I was interviewed, the more intrigued I was. The tax counsel was a very impressive guy who had been in the treasury department, the Internal Revenue Service. I was interviewed by only three people: the tax counsel, and another associate of Norton's, who were very attractive, bright, well-packaged men in their forties, probably, and Norton, who interviewed me personally. He sounded intriguing, obviously very bright. They all sounded like they were the kind of people it would be fun to work with, number one. Number two, they offered the job to



somebody else who turned it down, which was lucky for me. Number three, I learned later. I was only twenty-seven when I was being interviewed, and there were a number of instances where Norton asked something particular related to tax law. I said I had dealt with that and described it. I guess they began to think I was bullshitting them, because here I was, just a kid still, and how could I have had all that experience? Well, Jim Hurley, the tax counsel, who knew all the people at the Internal Revenue Service and the treasury, was able to go back and talk to them, and he could say, yes, I really did know what I was talking about, which I learned about later and which I gather impressed them.

Also, I pretty well concluded that Charles H. Carr's firm didn't hold a future for me. I would be used, perhaps decently compensated, but there was no future for me there. I was faced with the fact that although I brought in a few small clients, I really didn't have the ability or the network to build a practice. I wasn't at all sure that I wanted to spend my time even trying. So I was intrigued by the idea of being able to apply what I knew and work in that context, and also kind of being on the inside working on things rather than on the outside, where the problem had already arisen, giving a certain kind of advice or helping cure the problem and then not having any ongoing relationship.

SMITH: Simon was already building up what would be called a conglomerate, right? He had moved out of tomatoes.

1. The first part of the document is a letter from the President of the United States to the Congress, dated January 1, 1801. It is a very important document, as it is the first time that the President has addressed the Congress since the establishment of the new government. The letter is written in a very formal and dignified style, and it contains many important points. The President begins by expressing his gratitude to the Congress for the honor of being elected to the office of President. He then goes on to discuss the state of the Union, and the progress of the new government. He mentions the many difficulties that have been overcome, and the many successes that have been achieved. He also discusses the future of the country, and the steps that he has taken to ensure the stability and prosperity of the Union. The letter is a masterpiece of political writing, and it is a very important document in the history of the United States.

2. The second part of the document is a report from the Secretary of the Treasury, dated January 1, 1801. It is a very important document, as it is the first time that the Secretary has reported to the Congress since the establishment of the new government. The report is written in a very formal and dignified style, and it contains many important points. The Secretary begins by expressing his gratitude to the Congress for the honor of being appointed to the office of Secretary. He then goes on to discuss the state of the Treasury, and the progress of the new government. He mentions the many difficulties that have been overcome, and the many successes that have been achieved. He also discusses the future of the country, and the steps that he has taken to ensure the stability and prosperity of the Union. The report is a masterpiece of political writing, and it is a very important document in the history of the United States.

3. The third part of the document is a report from the Secretary of the Navy, dated January 1, 1801. It is a very important document, as it is the first time that the Secretary has reported to the Congress since the establishment of the new government. The report is written in a very formal and dignified style, and it contains many important points. The Secretary begins by expressing his gratitude to the Congress for the honor of being appointed to the office of Secretary. He then goes on to discuss the state of the Navy, and the progress of the new government. He mentions the many difficulties that have been overcome, and the many successes that have been achieved. He also discusses the future of the country, and the steps that he has taken to ensure the stability and prosperity of the Union. The report is a masterpiece of political writing, and it is a very important document in the history of the United States.

4. The fourth part of the document is a report from the Secretary of the War, dated January 1, 1801. It is a very important document, as it is the first time that the Secretary has reported to the Congress since the establishment of the new government. The report is written in a very formal and dignified style, and it contains many important points. The Secretary begins by expressing his gratitude to the Congress for the honor of being appointed to the office of Secretary. He then goes on to discuss the state of the War, and the progress of the new government. He mentions the many difficulties that have been overcome, and the many successes that have been achieved. He also discusses the future of the country, and the steps that he has taken to ensure the stability and prosperity of the Union. The report is a masterpiece of political writing, and it is a very important document in the history of the United States.

WILLIAMS: Hunt Foods, Inc. existed; that was the tomato business. I think the sales were sixty million dollars, or something like that. Simon had a position in Ohio Match Company, which was the second largest match manufacturing company. And that was it. He had been on the board of Northern Pacific; that stock had been owned through Ohio Match, but the stock had already been sold. Simon had just begun to collect art. Late in the previous year, 1954, he had been the subject of a *Fortune* magazine article, and that was the first time he had been in the press, so to speak. I had never read *Fortune*, but a friend of mine was aware of the article and referred me to it. So he was just really getting going.

SMITH: Okay. I think in the UCLA tapes we covered your activity with Simon, so we can just stop there. But I did have two other questions before we jump ahead twenty years. When did you get married?

WILLIAMS: In 1950.

SMITH: Did getting drafted have anything to do with your getting married?

WILLIAMS: Yes, that's why we got married. In fact, I was introduced to the woman who became my wife by a law school classmate of mine, whom I mentioned before, the one to whom I referred the job I didn't take. So we were trading things. He had rented a room in a house with a family, and they had rented another room to someone else, the woman who became my wife [Estelle Feinstein]. That's how we met. We dated and got married, and then I went into the service. We had a child not



too long thereafter. We separated in 1983, although it was obvious for some time before that we were going to separate.

SMITH: And you had two sons?

WILLIAMS: Two children, a boy [Ralph Andrew] and a girl [Susan Janeen].

SMITH: And what do they do?

WILLIAMS: My son is a psychologist. He has what you'd call a mixed practice of counseling of all ages, and he also does psychological evaluations for courts and others. He's married to a lawyer.

SMITH: He lives in Los Angeles?

WILLIAMS: He lives in Simi. He has two children, a boy and a girl. My daughter is married to a nice young man, not that young anymore, who was in the school of film and television at USC. He realized afterwards it wasn't a place you could make a living, but he wasn't trained for anything else, so he is a store manager. They lived out here until last year, and now they live in Burlington, Vermont. My daughter also has two children, a boy and a girl. She went back to school and got her master's in family counseling, and she is now trying to find a position in Burlington. So I have four grandchildren. My son and daughter both moved out of LA, at my encouragement, although I'd like them closer by, just because I don't think LA's a place to raise kids.

SMITH: And they grew up in Los Angeles, mostly?

1. The first part of the report deals with the general situation of the country.

2. The second part of the report deals with the economic situation of the country.

3. The third part of the report deals with the social situation of the country.

4. The fourth part of the report deals with the political situation of the country.

5. The fifth part of the report deals with the cultural situation of the country.

6. The sixth part of the report deals with the environmental situation of the country.

7. The seventh part of the report deals with the international situation of the country.

8. The eighth part of the report deals with the future of the country.

9. The ninth part of the report deals with the conclusion of the report.

10. The tenth part of the report deals with the appendix of the report.

11. The eleventh part of the report deals with the bibliography of the report.

12. The twelfth part of the report deals with the index of the report.

13. The thirteenth part of the report deals with the list of figures of the report.

14. The fourteenth part of the report deals with the list of tables of the report.

15. The fifteenth part of the report deals with the list of references of the report.

16. The sixteenth part of the report deals with the list of abbreviations of the report.

17. The seventeenth part of the report deals with the list of symbols of the report.

18. The eighteenth part of the report deals with the list of units of the report.

19. The nineteenth part of the report deals with the list of definitions of the report.

20. The twentieth part of the report deals with the list of footnotes of the report.

21. The twenty-first part of the report deals with the list of appendices of the report.

22. The twenty-second part of the report deals with the list of references of the report.

23. The twenty-third part of the report deals with the list of abbreviations of the report.

24. The twenty-fourth part of the report deals with the list of symbols of the report.

25. The twenty-fifth part of the report deals with the list of units of the report.

26. The twenty-sixth part of the report deals with the list of definitions of the report.

27. The twenty-seventh part of the report deals with the list of footnotes of the report.

28. The twenty-eighth part of the report deals with the list of appendices of the report.

WILLIAMS: Yes.

SMITH: Did they go to college here?

WILLIAMS: My daughter went to USC, and my son went to Cal State [California State University], Northridge. He would have gone to UCLA if I hadn't been there at the time. But he was not a terribly motivated student. He was very bright, but not a good student in his earlier days. He was kind of a late bloomer.

SMITH: To change the subject, were you already getting involved in local politics, or Democratic Party politics at this time? "At this time" being after you come back from Harvard? Or maybe even before?

WILLIAMS: My first involvement in politics was in 1948. I wasn't old enough to vote, but I walked the Bronx and pounded on doors and spoke Yiddish to the housewives and whoever else was home, urging them to vote for Harry Truman and not Henry Wallace. In 1950 I was on the speaker's bureau for Jimmy Roosevelt, who was running for governor.

SMITH: So you would take the train down from Boston to do that?

WILLIAMS: Yes. But then I dropped out, really. I was in the service. Actually, when I was still in law school I was part of a group that went down to talk to Dwight Eisenhower about running for president on the Democratic ticket. It didn't succeed, obviously. I voted for [Adlai] Stevenson in '52 and '56. In '52 I was in Korea. In '56 I wasn't involved at all. In 1960 I did a little work for Jack [John F.] Kennedy.



SMITH: In the primaries, or after he was the nominee?

WILLIAMS: After he was the nominee. I contributed to his campaign. I also contributed to Lyndon Johnson's campaign, though I didn't work for him. In '66 I got involved in local politics in Orange County. In '68 I was Orange County chairman for Alan Cranston. I was finance chairman for Dick Hannah, who was running for re-election to Congress, and I was on the campaign for Ken Cory, who was running for assembly. I was Orange County chairman, and state vice-chairman for Bobby Kennedy. That was my biggest involvement in politics, in part because I was trying to decide whether I wanted to make politics my own next career.

SMITH: I see.

WILLIAMS: I concluded I didn't. I went to the Democratic convention as a Kennedy delegate.

SMITH: Even though you didn't have a candidate.

WILLIAMS: Even though we didn't have a candidate anymore.

SMITH: So you were there in Chicago when the whole mess happened.

WILLIAMS: Oh, yes. It was an exciting time. Not a proud moment. The California delegation was one of the more militant ones there, and it was inspired by Mayor [Richard] Daley's antics. The delegation played a reasonably significant role in what I'd call the elimination of the smoke-filled room, which I think, in retrospect, has been a mistake. I didn't go to the '72 convention. I looked at the delegates on TV and



said, "These people came from nowhere and they're going back to nowhere. They're not the kind of people who are going to be able to hold the candidate accountable." Accountability has taken on a whole different cast in recent years in politics.

In '72 I was at UCLA [Dean and Professor of Management of the Graduate School of Management], with [Ronald] Reagan as governor, so I was not active in Democratic Party politics. First of all, I wasn't that inspired. Further, I thought it probably didn't make good sense to get involved in Democratic politics with Reagan as governor. I contributed to George McGovern's campaign, but I asked my wife to write the check. We learned later on that she ended up on [Richard] Nixon's enemies list. Starting in '73 or '74, they began auditing our tax return. There was nothing there to audit, it was a very simple return, but the audit never seemed to end. We learned later what the problem was.

Jimmy Carter was the first Democratic candidate for president in my adult life to that time, whose campaign I neither worked for nor contributed to.

SMITH: Did you contribute to any of his opponents in the primaries?

WILLIAMS: I can't even remember who they were. I think Lloyd Bentsen was one.

SMITH: I don't remember either. Nonetheless, you got appointed chair of the Securities and Exchange Commission [SEC] by Carter, so something was at work besides campaign contributions.

WILLIAMS: That's right. I have a lot of respect for Jimmy Carter. He's probably a

better example as an ex-president than he was as a president.

SMITH: That's a funny thing; he seems a better person than a politician.

WILLIAMS: That's right. I think that's what hurt him in a lot of ways. He had good human instincts. But when he went on television wearing a sweater to talk to the people, it was wrong; it was a good human thing to do, but not good political instinct, and that was typical of a lot of things he did.

SMITH: Did you ever have a sense when you were in Washington that he was going to be a one-term president?

WILLIAMS: No. In fact, to the contrary; the only condition that he imposed on me was that I serve the full five-year term as chairman, which assumed his re-election, because the chair serves at the pleasure of the president. So I assumed that, and I was prepared for it. Indeed, I had been planning my next move, which was that in my last year, after the election, I would begin conversations with the White House because I wanted to be appointed as ambassador to the OECD [Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development] in Paris; that's what I viewed as my next step. It didn't work.

SMITH: No. Have you ever worked for a Republican candidate?

WILLIAMS: No.

SMITH: To some degree politics is cultural, and to some degree it's philosophical.

WILLIAMS: Well, I have voted for Republicans, but I have never worked for one. I



have never contributed to the Democratic National Committee either. My response has always been, "I contribute to candidates, I don't contribute to parties." I don't think I've ever contributed to a Republican, I may be wrong. Yes, I contributed to Dick Riordan's campaign for mayor; he's a Republican. But it wasn't a partisan campaign. I remember when I was living in Orange County, all my close friends were Republicans. I was driving down to San Diego one day with one of them, and he turned to me and said, "How the hell can you be a democrat? You don't even sound like a Democrat at times." Philosophically, I'm a lot closer to the values of the Democratic Party, but, also, with Democrats in power I felt I had more opportunity to help shape the future of things than I would if I were in the Republican Party. In some ways my economic values are more Republican than Democrat, or were at the time. They're not now. I'm more Democrat now. But certainly all my social values were Democratic.

SMITH: To what degree was it also a question of the Republicans being aligned with provincial and anti-Semitic aspects of American life?

WILLIAMS: I didn't feel that as much, although I touched on it a little in Orange County. I made quite a presence in Orange County in '68, being chairman of Bobby Kennedy's campaign, and also chairing the United Jewish Welfare Fund Drive. You might say I was the most visible Jew in Orange County.

SMITH: But also, being chair of Kennedy's campaign and supporting Cranston, it



sounds like you may have been aligned with the CDC [California Democratic Council] wing of the Democratic Party.

WILLIAMS: No I wasn't. I didn't agree with the CDC, but I agreed with Alan Cranston. So that's where I guess I was always looking at a candidate. Actually, the CDC may have agreed with Bobby Kennedy, but I don't think Bobby Kennedy necessarily agreed with the CDC.

SMITH: In '48, what led you to make this decision of Truman over Wallace, particularly given, within the Jewish community—

WILLIAMS: It was the liberalism of Wallace, which I thought was too extreme. Also, Wallace couldn't win. He would just drain off votes for Truman, which would result in Dewey winning the election. I said then, and I guess it was one of my proudest predictions, that Truman was going to go down as one of the great presidents of the twentieth century. I admired his independence. I thought he was terrific.

[Tape II, Side One]

SMITH: I wanted now to jump ahead to your involvement with the [J. Paul] Getty [Trust]. You were at the Securities and Exchange Commission from '77 to '81. With Reagan's election you realized you were going to have to get another job. What were the options that were open to you at that time?

WILLIAMS: Well, it was Christmas time, 1980, that I began to focus on what I

1. The first part of the document discusses the importance of maintaining accurate records of all transactions and activities. It emphasizes the need for transparency and accountability in financial reporting.

2. The second part of the document outlines the various methods and techniques used to collect and analyze data. It includes a detailed description of the experimental procedures and the statistical analysis performed.

3. The third part of the document presents the results of the study. It includes a series of tables and graphs that illustrate the findings of the research. The data shows a clear trend of increasing activity over time.

4. The fourth part of the document discusses the implications of the findings. It suggests that the results have significant implications for the field of study and may lead to further research in this area.

5. The fifth part of the document concludes the study. It summarizes the main findings and provides a final statement on the importance of the research.

might do next. I didn't know what I was going to do.

SMITH: You could have gone back to UCLA, correct?

WILLIAMS: I could have gone back to UCLA. Not as a dean, because I had been replaced as dean. In fact, I'm still on leave as a member of the faculty, which is kind of crazy. I could have gone back as a professor, but I had no interest in doing that. Some things were pretty important. Looking at what my alternatives might be caused me to look at my marriage, too. I didn't have a lot of money, but I had enough that I could have considered something that wouldn't be as full time and as consuming as another career. I thought of what that would mean in terms of my time and my freedom, and I came face to face with something I had been aware of for some time, which was that I didn't have the kind of marital relationship to which I could devote a large part of my life. So I decided, "All right then, I need another career that will be more consuming." I got calls from several search committees about university presidencies—not offers, but asking if I would be interested. I pretty well concluded, at that time at least, and it's probably still true today, that being a university president meant being a fund-raiser, and I didn't want to spend my life being a fund-raiser, particularly when I would be raising funds to pay the heating bill, rather than building the future of an institution.

Actually, when the Getty came along I was in negotiation with a New York law firm to open their Washington office. I wasn't really wild about that, but it



sounded like a reasonable thing to do. I certainly wasn't one to be a day-to-day practitioner, but I felt I had enough experience in the field of corporate law to be a fairly sound adviser. The question was whether I could be a rainmaker or not. I wasn't sure, but I thought it was worth a try, probably. I liked Washington. I could see living there. People said, "But what would it be like to live in Washington when you're "out" rather than "in"?" That didn't seem to bother me. On the other hand, I had my kids here, and my lifetime of friends here. I thought it would be nice to come back, but I didn't have anything specific to come back to. And then, along came the Getty.

SMITH: Do you know what the connection was that led you to being suggested as the CEO? Maybe what you were being hired to do is something we need to discuss, because it seems that you created your job.

WILLIAMS: Well, as I began to explore what kinds of things I might do, I thought about people I should talk to for advice or ideas. I began to think about people I knew who had done some of the kinds of things I had done, or who at least, at some level, instinctively or intellectually or a combination of both, would understand me and therefore be more compatible and free-ranging in thinking about what I might do. I talked to John Gardner, I talked to Norman Cousins, and Franklin Murphy, who I had known for many years. I'm trying to remember where I saw Franklin. I was either out here on a visit or he was in Washington. Anyway, we had breakfast

1. The first part of the document discusses the importance of maintaining accurate records of all transactions and the role of the accounting department in ensuring the integrity of the financial statements.

2. It also highlights the need for regular audits and the importance of having a strong internal control system in place to prevent fraud and errors.

3. The second part of the document focuses on the importance of budgeting and forecasting, and how these tools can be used to manage the company's resources effectively.

4. It also discusses the importance of having a clear understanding of the company's financial position and the ability to identify potential risks and opportunities.

5. The third part of the document discusses the importance of having a strong financial reporting system in place, and how this can be used to provide accurate and timely information to the company's management and stakeholders.

6. It also discusses the importance of having a strong financial planning system in place, and how this can be used to develop and implement the company's financial strategy.

7. The fourth part of the document discusses the importance of having a strong financial management system in place, and how this can be used to ensure the company's financial health and stability.

8. It also discusses the importance of having a strong financial control system in place, and how this can be used to prevent fraud and errors.

9. The fifth part of the document discusses the importance of having a strong financial reporting system in place, and how this can be used to provide accurate and timely information to the company's management and stakeholders.

10. It also discusses the importance of having a strong financial planning system in place, and how this can be used to develop and implement the company's financial strategy.

11. The sixth part of the document discusses the importance of having a strong financial management system in place, and how this can be used to ensure the company's financial health and stability.

12. It also discusses the importance of having a strong financial control system in place, and how this can be used to prevent fraud and errors.

13. The seventh part of the document discusses the importance of having a strong financial reporting system in place, and how this can be used to provide accurate and timely information to the company's management and stakeholders.

14. It also discusses the importance of having a strong financial planning system in place, and how this can be used to develop and implement the company's financial strategy.

15. The eighth part of the document discusses the importance of having a strong financial management system in place, and how this can be used to ensure the company's financial health and stability.

16. It also discusses the importance of having a strong financial control system in place, and how this can be used to prevent fraud and errors.

17. The ninth part of the document discusses the importance of having a strong financial reporting system in place, and how this can be used to provide accurate and timely information to the company's management and stakeholders.

18. It also discusses the importance of having a strong financial planning system in place, and how this can be used to develop and implement the company's financial strategy.

19. The tenth part of the document discusses the importance of having a strong financial management system in place, and how this can be used to ensure the company's financial health and stability.

20. It also discusses the importance of having a strong financial control system in place, and how this can be used to prevent fraud and errors.

together someplace. He didn't have anything specific in mind, but, you know, these are the kind of people who travel in wide circles. The next thing I knew, Franklin had been contacted by somebody on the then board of the Getty about any ideas he might have about what the Getty ought to become, and also who might lead it.

They had been talking to all kinds of people to get ideas. They had talked to Derek Bok at Harvard, and they had talked to a number of other people. Franklin suggested that they think in broader humanistic terms than just a museum. They seemed to respond to that, which surprises me, because they are a bunch of not very broad-gauged, broad-minded intellectual people, but maybe it was because it was Franklin who was talking, and Franklin could be very persuasive. Having just recently had breakfast with me, Franklin said, "I've got somebody I think you ought to talk to, who I think would make sense." And that's how it began. I flew out and met with the then board of about six or seven people. I spent the day with them, and I think that was all the time I spent with them, if I recall correctly.

SMITH: What was it that they told you they wanted you to do at that point?

WILLIAMS: They really didn't know what they wanted me to do. They knew they had this small museum, which didn't have any money, but at some point Mr. Getty's estate was going to close and at that time it was worth somewhere around a billion dollars. So they were worried about somebody managing the money, somebody who had some academic background and some political sense, and they were intrigued by

1. The first part of the document discusses the importance of maintaining accurate records of all transactions and activities. It emphasizes the need for transparency and accountability in financial reporting.

2. The second part of the document outlines the various methods and techniques used to collect and analyze data. It includes a detailed description of the experimental procedures and the statistical analysis performed.

3. The third part of the document presents the results of the study. It includes a series of tables and graphs that illustrate the findings of the research. The data shows a clear trend of increasing activity over time.

4. The fourth part of the document discusses the implications of the findings. It suggests that the results have significant implications for the field of study and may lead to further research in this area.

5. The fifth part of the document concludes the study. It summarizes the main findings and provides a final statement on the importance of the research.

this idea that Franklin had. That was the extent of it. My last day at the SEC was a Friday night, February 28, or something like that. I think I chaired a conference that night, and it was my last day there. I came back home, and at eleven o'clock or so, Washington time, the phone rang. It was the chairman of the Getty offering me the job.

SMITH: This was Harold Berg?

WILLIAMS: Yes.

SMITH: Was it hard for you to decide what to do?

WILLIAMS: No. I think I had had one or two conversations with Berg between the meeting out here and that time, I don't recall, specifically. I know I did talk to Franklin.

SMITH: Now, when you left Simon, in '70, you had spent eleven years in more or less the public sector, making probably a fraction of what you would have made in the private sector.

WILLIAMS: That's right.

SMITH: Was money a concern for you, in terms of what you should do?

WILLIAMS: Somewhat. I took an 80 percent cut in pay when I went to the university. And, actually, the SEC paid me less than I was then making at the university.

SMITH: I would presume when you were at the SEC you had to put all of your

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO
DEPARTMENT OF CHEMISTRY
5408 S. UNIVERSITY AVE.
CHICAGO, ILL. 60637

TO: [Name]
[Address]
[City, State, Zip]

FROM: [Name]
[Address]
[City, State, Zip]

SUBJECT: [Subject]
[Address]
[City, State, Zip]

RE: [Subject]
[Address]
[City, State, Zip]

DATE: [Date]
[Address]
[City, State, Zip]

BY: [Name]
[Address]
[City, State, Zip]

stock in blind trust.

WILLIAMS: Yes it was all in blind trust, and the market hadn't been any great shakes. I wanted to make more money, but that was not critical. Actually, I came to the Getty for less than the amount of money I was talking to the law firm about. But being out of the public sector, as such, I did want to make more money than I had been making the last eleven years. At that time there was a very distinct possibility that my wife and I would be separating. We had enough money between us, but splitting it up, with everything that goes with that, meant I needed to make more money.

SMITH: Of course your kids were grown by that time.

WILLIAMS: The kids were grown, which was part of the reason I felt the freedom to think about separating.

SMITH: So they offered you the job on February 28, and it's publicly announced March 3. That seems a very quick decision. What was the actual timetable for you to move in and to take over?

WILLIAMS: I told them I wanted some time to do several things. One, I needed time to get moved back. But, secondly, as long I was in the east I wanted to spend some time traveling around arts institutions and talking to people in the arts. Before I went to UCLA I did the same thing; I went to other business schools and I talked to consulting firms and places that recruited, just to get a sense of what I was getting



into. That's just basically my style. I wanted to be able to visit museums and other kinds of humanities-related institutions and get some grounding in what was going on—what the needs were and what the values were and so forth. I don't remember whether at that time I set a date or not, but I said it would be several months, and all I wanted from them at that point was traveling expenses. I came to work on May 10, or something like that. I spent the interim time basically getting moved back. I had to sell the house in Washington, which we hadn't yet done.

SMITH: I would guess that you must have talked to Norton Simon at this point, given that his museum was already in place.

WILLIAMS: Well, I told him. I certainly called him early on and told him what I was going to do. I think it was in March that I attended the Getty trustees' meeting. I had been elected a trustee. I had had dinner with Norton the night before the meeting. The Getty hadn't been acquiring anything, and Norton was looking at a [Nicolas] Poussin painting. We got to talking about it, and Norton said, "Why don't we buy it together?" I said I thought it was a great idea. So I took it to the trustees the next day, they agreed, and we bought it together. It was the first purchase that the Getty had made in some time. I liked the idea of a purchase with Norton. I hoped more would come out of it than eventually did.

As I say, I talked to all kinds of people. In Washington I visited all the museums and talked to the leadership; I talked to Nancy Hanks, who was no longer at



the NEA, but she had been the guiding light during the glory years of the NEA. I went up to New York and met with the board of the Metropolitan and talked to the staff. I went up to Boston. I met John Walsh for the first time. I met a lot of people for the first time. And I just asked a lot of questions.

SMITH: Looking at materials from that period, at one point it looked like the museum was going to get eight hundred million, at another point, it was a billion, but it was not anywhere near as much as you wound up getting. What kind of advice were people throwing out to you, since they could use the Getty as a way of dreaming their dreams? What kind of suggestions were different people proposing?

WILLIAMS: Actually, I wasn't looking for advice at that point, although I was getting some. I found, though, that there was a lot of misunderstanding and a lot of apprehension out there. Misunderstanding, because many people thought that we would be spending all the money on making grants. They were anticipating that a lot of money was going to be dispersed, so they were talking about their needs, at a pretty fundamental and pedestrian level. Secondly, there was a concern on the part of many that, inconsistent with what I've just said, the Getty was going to be spending all this money acquiring art and was going to destroy the art market. Along with that, there was no one at the Getty at that time, including me, who had any kind of reputation in the field, who would give any measure of confidence that good judgment or sanity would prevail.



SMITH: Though you did have Otto Wittmann on the board of trustees, and Federico Zeri.

WILLIAMS: And everybody else on the board, including me, was a philistine. Of course, I had been through that before in various positions. I knew that there was no way to convince people other than by what I ended up doing, so it didn't particularly bother me. But it was an environment where people were very nice to me, because they knew I was going to have some influence over a lot of money. At that point I wasn't looking for advice, I was just asking a lot of questions, just trying to get my own orientation.

SMITH: Were there any hunches that you began to formulate, or impressions about what seemed to be intelligent practice and what seemed to be dumb?

WILLIAMS: Yes. When you're talking about what the dreams were, one of the first interviews I gave was with a woman who wrote for *Art in America*, if I recall correctly. She asked me something along the line of, "What was your biggest surprise or disappointment in setting up the Getty programs?" And I said that my biggest disappointment was I couldn't find the dreamers. Which at first I didn't understand, but then as I thought about it I realized, you know, if there is no hope, you don't dream, because dreams are just painful. Everyone was pretty much on a maintenance track, so I realized that what we had to do was to ferret out where the interstices were. But we couldn't find people who had these magnificent dreams of what they

1. The first part of the document discusses the importance of maintaining accurate records of all transactions and activities. It emphasizes the need for transparency and accountability in financial reporting.

2. The second part of the document outlines the various methods and techniques used to collect and analyze data. It includes a detailed description of the experimental procedures and the statistical analysis performed.

3. The third part of the document presents the results of the study. It includes a series of tables and graphs that illustrate the findings of the research. The data shows a clear trend of increasing activity over time.

4. The fourth part of the document discusses the implications of the findings. It suggests that the results have significant implications for the field of study and may lead to further research in this area.

5. The fifth part of the document concludes the study. It summarizes the main findings and provides a final statement on the importance of the research.

would like to see happen. We had to do it ourselves.

SMITH: So one of your tasks was to identify the dreamers who were hiding out there?

WILLIAMS: Yes.

SMITH: Now, one of them, presumably, was John Walsh, because you brought him in relatively early on.

WILLIAMS: Not that early, no. I think John came aboard in about September of '83. I met with John a couple of times before he agreed. But no, he wasn't one of the dreamers. By that time I had "retired"—the nice way to put it—the then director of the museum, just because I had to get him out of there, and I put a young guy in as acting, because he was there, named Steve [Stephen] Rountree, who now has a very senior position. In fact, he is the only one who was here then that's really moved up.

Early on, I hired two people for the purpose of working with me to develop a plan, both of whom I encountered in strange ways: Lani [Leilani Lattin] Duke and Nancy [Englander]. I went to the board in May, which was my first meeting since I had physically arrived, and said, "I need a year, I'll come back this time next year with a plan. In the meantime, we're going to be traveling the field." I hadn't hired either Lani or Nancy by then.

SMITH: Had you met them at that point?

WILLIAMS: I had met Nancy, I hadn't met Lani. When I talked to Nancy Hanks in



Washington, among other things I asked, "Do you know any people that I ought to be looking at?" She said there was a terrific person in California who I really ought to meet, who was then executive director of the California Arts Council, I think it was called, and had worked with Hanks at NEA.. That was Lani. I met her shortly after I got out here, probably in June or late May. She was the first person I hired.

SMITH: I think she was in the California Federation for the Arts; it wasn't the state organization, but some sort of nonprofit umbrella.

WILLIAMS: Right. And the circumstances behind Nancy's hire were peculiar. I got a letter one day from one of my closest friends, who lived in New York. He was with Warner Communications, as it was called. He attached a résumé saying, "This is an interesting person I think you might have a place for in your thinking or in your organization," and it was Nancy's résumé. She had been with the National Endowment for the Humanities and the MacDowell Colony [Foundation], and she was fluent in languages. As I say, this letter was from someone whom I knew well, and I had a lot of respect for his judgment. If he recommended her, I felt I ought to see her. So I invited her to come down for an interview. At that time I said, "I don't know what I'm going to need. You've got some interesting experience, I'll get back to you."

What I didn't realize was that Ed didn't know [Nancy]. I thought I was getting a recommendation. It turns out that Nancy had known somebody else who



worked at Warner's. She was looking for a job, she had gone in and talked to him, and he asked her whether she had anything in mind or whether there was anything he could do to help her. Maybe Nancy has already told you this, but she said she had just read in the *New York Times* that I had left the SEC and was going to the Getty. She said that really sounded interesting, and she'd sure like to meet Harold Williams. And her friend said, "Well, there's a guy right down the hall here who is one of his closest friends." He took her down and introduced her to Ed, who did something I didn't expect him to do, which is send me a résumé of somebody he didn't know. Anyway, that's how I met Nancy.

SMITH: You must have been impressed.

WILLIAMS: I was, I was. She was obviously bright, and she knew a lot about the field. As I thought about how to proceed, I visualized needing to travel around western Europe to get a sense of what the needs were there. Nancy's language skills obviously would be valuable, and her master's degree in comparative literature. She had just the right kind of qualities. So after I had hired Lani, I called Nancy and invited her to come join us. They both arrived within a few days of each other, in July. Shortly thereafter, we had a meeting, and I said, "Look, I don't care what you think the Getty ought to do, and I don't care what I think the Getty ought to do. We've got to get out there and find out what the needs are, and then we'll figure out where we can make a difference. This is a very special place; we've got unusual

1. The first part of the document discusses the importance of maintaining accurate records of all transactions and activities. It emphasizes the need for transparency and accountability in financial reporting.

2. The second part of the document outlines the various methods and techniques used to collect and analyze data. It includes a detailed description of the experimental procedures and the statistical analysis performed.

3. The third part of the document presents the results of the study. It includes a series of tables and graphs that illustrate the findings of the research. The data shows a clear trend of increasing activity over time.

4. The fourth part of the document discusses the implications of the findings. It suggests that the results have significant implications for the field of study and may lead to further research in this area.

5. The fifth part of the document concludes the study. It summarizes the main findings and provides a final statement on the importance of the research.

resources, and a clean slate, and we can think in a lot of unusual ways about it."

So we began to explore, and Lani went off in her direction, and Nancy and I in ours, and it wasn't until later, after we had done some initial scouting, that we began to hit some of the places together. We all did a first cut, and then as things began to triangulate, as we began to hear the same things over and over, it was then a matter of determining who out there should be more involved with us, and we began traveling together to various places. But somewhere along the way I wrote a paper, which I called a hypothesis, and I said, "This is not an answer, but what I'm beginning to hear from you and from others is that these are the kinds of things we might test more specifically to see whether they would hold up as priorities for us."

SMITH: And this entailed starting a humanities center and a conservation institute?

WILLIAMS: Yes. That was pretty much what we decided, but it got more specific and tangible as we explored.

SMITH: Now, you had a museum, which, from what I can gather from the press at the time, was one of the most popular museums in the country, actually, but one which had a very spotty reputation among scholars and connoisseurs.

WILLIAMS: Yes, it was popular. It was small. Our research later on showed that people were more attracted by the site and by the building than they were by the collection—by the ambiance of the place, in other words. We were limited by the parking restrictions, so it couldn't get too popular, but it was a tourist attraction,



certainly.

SMITH: You said you had to "retire" the director, Stephen Garrett. How long did it take you to realize that you were going have to basically start from ground zero with the staff?

WILLIAMS: I realized that pretty quickly. It was just a matter of timing.

SMITH: Was that something that the trustees were telling you?

WILLIAMS: No. My initial thought was that I would replace Stephen when I found a successor. I don't fully remember the reasons why, but it reached a point where it was clear to me that not only could I not wait to find a successor, but I had to send a signal that Stephen Garrett was not the kind of director the museum was going to have. He wasn't getting the message across internally, either, that needed to be gotten across. I preferred to have a vacancy than to have Stephen in the position.

SMITH: What about the curators that were under him? Were you concerned about the individuals who were in charge of the three major collections?

WILLIAMS: To some extent. I'd say I was more concerned because they weren't being led; they weren't being controlled. I thought Steve Rountree might do a better job in controlling them, but even if he didn't, the message that things were not going to be as they were was a pretty important message to get across.

SMITH: Now, this was a message that was both internal and external.

WILLIAMS: Yes. Things began moving on many different fronts, and before we

1. The first part of the document discusses the importance of maintaining accurate records of all transactions and activities. It emphasizes the need for transparency and accountability in financial reporting.

2. The second part of the document outlines the various methods and techniques used to collect and analyze data. It includes a detailed description of the experimental procedures and the statistical analysis performed.

3. The third part of the document presents the results of the study. It includes a series of tables and graphs that illustrate the findings of the research. The data shows a clear trend of increasing activity over time.

4. The fourth part of the document discusses the implications of the findings. It suggests that the results have significant implications for the field of research and may lead to further developments in the future.

5. The fifth part of the document concludes the study. It summarizes the main findings and provides a final statement on the importance of the research.

had our second or third board meeting, the young guy who then headed our photo archive came to me with a photo of a drawing of Cleopatra, by Rembrandt. It was going to come up for auction, and he suggested we ought to buy it. We spent a lot of time talking about it, and I thought it sounded like a pretty good idea. I was really flying blind on some of this stuff, just trying to make judgments. I went to the board with it at the next meeting, and the board agreed to go ahead. They asked if this meant we were going to have a drawings collection, and I said, "Well, maybe a small one, but of the same quality as the paintings." So we bought the drawing at auction. This guy from the photo archives ultimately became our curator of drawings, then our curator of paintings, and then he went to the Metropolitan as curator of drawings. A home-grown product. We have a number of those that I'm really quite proud of.

SMITH: Is this George Goldner?

WILLIAMS: George Goldner, yes. Then a dealer came to me with a piece of sculpture that had been found in Sweden. Actually, he came in to see Burton Fredericksen, who was then curator of paintings. It looked like a great piece of sculpture. I talked to Otto Wittmann about it and took it to the board, and we decided to buy it. It was a sculpture by Giambologna, the first piece of sculpture we bought, and it's still one of the finest we have. The board asked again, "Are we going to have a sculpture collection?" I said, "Not necessarily."

I'm just rambling now. But things were moving at the time, and some things

[The text on this page is extremely faint and illegible. It appears to be a list or a series of entries, possibly a table of contents or a list of references, but the specific details cannot be discerned.]

were being put in place. Nancy, Lani, and I kept the board posted at each of the meetings, from the September meeting on, about the progress we were making and the things we were seeing. It was in May of '82 that we came to the board with a vision, and the estate hadn't closed yet.

SMITH: So you still had minimal operating funds.

WILLIAMS: We had minimal operating funds.

SMITH: I did want to talk a little bit about some of the people who were on the Getty Oil side: Harold Berg, Sidney Petersen, and Robert Miller. Berg was chairman of the museum trustees as well as chair of Getty Oil.

WILLIAMS: I don't remember whether he was still chair of Getty Oil or he was out of it already. I don't remember the timing of it. I think Sid was already chair.

SMITH: He was CEO of Getty Oil, according to the *New York Times*.

WILLIAMS: Maybe so, maybe so.

SMITH: And Berg was chair.

WILLIAMS: You're right, you're right.

SMITH: It sounds like in this whole, somewhat complicated dance that's going on with Gordon Getty, Getty Oil, Pennzoil, and Texaco that Harold Berg was an ally and Sidney Petersen became an enemy. Was that true?

WILLIAMS: It took a while to evolve. When Getty's estate closed, obviously the largest asset, almost the entire thing, was Getty Oil stock. The estate wasn't entirely

1. The first part of the document discusses the importance of maintaining accurate records of all transactions and activities. It emphasizes the need for transparency and accountability in financial reporting.

2. The second part of the document outlines the various methods and techniques used to collect and analyze data. It includes a detailed description of the experimental procedures and the statistical analysis performed.

3. The third part of the document presents the results of the study. It includes a series of tables and graphs that illustrate the findings of the research. The data shows a clear trend of increasing activity over time.

4. The fourth part of the document discusses the implications of the findings. It suggests that the results have significant implications for the field of research and may lead to further developments in the future.

5. The fifth part of the document concludes the study. It summarizes the main findings and provides a final statement on the importance of the research.

Getty Oil stock, but it was an overwhelming percentage. I was concerned from the beginning, and the board by and large shared my concern, that it was not appropriate, long term, for a foundation to have that much of its assets in a single stock, particularly in the stock of an industry that was as volatile as the oil industry. But there were no immediate plans to do anything about it.

It wasn't long before I got a sense that all was not well. Gordon was rattling around, and I was not impressed with Sid Petersen. I think it was still in 1981 or early '82 that I called Marty Lipton, a lawyer with Wachtel, Lipton, whom I had known from my commission days. I said, "Marty, somewhere along the way I'm going to need you, and I want to make sure nobody else has you." Things began to get kind of sticky. Gordon was making a run at becoming chair and CEO of Getty Oil. He represented 39 or 40 percent of the stock, through the Sarah Getty Trust.

SMITH: I think it was close to 41 percent, and you represented 12 percent.

WILLIAMS: So between the two of us we were a majority. Harold was off the Getty Oil board then. Anyway, Gordon was making noises, and Sid and Bob Miller and his investment bankers came in to talk to me a couple of times to make sure that I understood how irresponsible Gordon was and to make sure our stock stayed in place. In a sense, Sid and Bob were kind of stonewalling us, too, and it reached a point where I said to Sid one day, "Sid, you've got to be careful. You can't piss on a majority of the stock." I didn't want to align myself with Gordon, because I didn't

1. The first part of the paper discusses the importance of maintaining accurate records of all transactions and the role of the accounting system in providing reliable financial information.

2. It then examines the various methods used to collect and analyze data, highlighting the strengths and weaknesses of each approach.

3. The third section focuses on the development of a robust framework for evaluating the performance of different accounting systems, taking into account both qualitative and quantitative factors.

4. Finally, the paper concludes by discussing the implications of the findings for future research and practice, emphasizing the need for continued innovation and collaboration in the field.

want Gordon to be running the company, but the more this went on, the more concerned I became about the tenuousness of our stock position. It seemed to me that their objective was to keep us neutral and stonewall Gordon.

Then a board meeting took place, and Gordon walked out of the meeting, during the break or something, or he just wasn't present in the meeting, I don't recall which, but the board, in his absence, did something that was totally antagonistic to Gordon; they took some kind of a vote on something. I've got to refresh my recollections.

SMITH: Was this before they tried to take away his control of the Sarah Getty Trust?

WILLIAMS: It may have been tied to that. They were making some alliances, and Gordon was being challenged. I think the board decided they were going to take a position on that.

SMITH: And J. Paul Getty II and Claire Getty, and I guess others, were challenging Gordon Getty's control over the Getty family money.

WILLIAMS: Yes, and then the thing really began to explode.

SMITH: And then it became clear that the management of Getty Oil was behind these law suits, right?

WILLIAMS: Right. At that point I figured this whole thing was going to fall apart, and I called Marty in. We threw in our lot with Gordon and I think demanded that



the board be replaced, if I recall correctly, or something of the sort.

SMITH: It doesn't sound like you were particularly sympathetic to Gordon, or didn't trust what he was planning to do, and you didn't like the Getty Oil management, so you had two options, neither of which was very palatable.

WILLIAMS: That's right.

SMITH: What led you to decide that aligning with Gordon would get you out of this in a better position, financially and with respect to the museum?

WILLIAMS: I didn't know whether it would get us out better financially, but I felt that something had to change. A board that would behave that way, that was more concerned about holding onto their position than doing what was right for the company and its shareholders, had to be restructured in some fashion. Further, a 60–40 percent split in the shareholders, with the 40 percent militant in its opposition, was creating an untenable situation, distracting management and the board, and it would continue to do so, to the detriment of the company and the shareholders. That was my objective—not to turn it over to Gordon, but to get the board restructured. That was when, as part of the settlement, I went on the board, and three people that Gordon nominated went on the board.

SMITH: So you would not have been an ex-officio member of the board, having so much stock under your control?

WILLIAMS: No. They were silly not to have invited me on the board earlier. I



think they were assuming that Harold Berg would be able to control what the trust did. Of course my moves on this thing were not board approved, and Harold was pretty upset with it; in fact, he raised that at the next trustees meeting, and there was quite a Donnybrook between Harold and me. But there was nothing the board could do at that point; it was too late.

SMITH: The majority of the museum trustees at this time were still Getty Oil people, right, or more or less?

WILLIAMS: No, but there were some affiliations. [Norris] Bramlett was formerly Getty Oil, and Berg, but I don't think any of the others were.

SMITH: I was thinking of Stuart Peeler and [J.] Patrick Whaley.

WILLIAMS: They had some affiliation with J. Paul, but not with the company. I attended one Getty Oil board meeting, and then along came Pennzoil. And that was the beginning of the Pennzoil-Texaco saga.

[Tape II, Side Two]

SMITH: It has been said, both in print and in folklore, that you played a major role in determining the outcome.

WILLIAMS: I think that's true. I think we really played the pivotal role in it.

SMITH: How did you define the problem, both in terms of Getty Oil, and also the problem of getting the museum extricated from the larger problem of having too much of its assets tied up in the stock of one company? What led you to make the



decisions that you made?

WILLIAMS: The key issue was whether Gordon would go with Pennzoil. As was revealed later, he had made a deal to go along, which he didn't disclose to the Getty Oil board. I was in favor of the Pennzoil deal because it was a way out, and I felt the price was a reasonable one under the circumstances. The discussions at the board meeting were very contentious. Goldman Sachs, representing the Getty Oil company, kept saying that the price was not adequate. But it was pretty clear to me that the underlying issue was management wanting to maintain the independence of the company, which I understood. But, finally, with the pressure on, there was really no question that it had to go, and I had indicated at the meeting that the trust was prepared to go along, although we had made no commitment to do so.

SMITH: Did you have the option of selling your stocks separately, making a separate deal with Pennzoil?

WILLIAMS: No. They wouldn't have wanted 11 percent of the stock. Actually, the finding of the Texas court in relation to whether there was Pennzoil deal or not was an erroneous finding. It was a Texas jury, and that's all I can say for it, because the deal was all contingent on acceptable contracts. In fact, at the board meeting we agreed to go ahead and draft an agreement, to negotiate the terms, specifically. I waited around New York the following day, and I kept calling my counsel's office, saying, "Do we have any documents yet?" We didn't. I said I had to get back to LA



because it was my birthday. I had separated from my wife, I was going to have dinner with my kids, and I particularly wanted to be with them and wanted them to be with me, because it was a difficult time. So I said, "I'm going to go back. You can call me, or send me documents when they're ready, or I'll come back to New York."

I got off the plane, called my office, and Marty Lipton had called. I called him back and he asked me whether we would agree to sell to Texaco at a higher price. My first question to Marty was, do we have a deal with Pennzoil? He said no, we didn't. I said, "Do we have a contractual obligation with Pennzoil?" He said no, we didn't. I agreed. So I said, "Fine, let's go." He and the Texaco representatives then went to visit Gordon, who agreed to go along, and we said yes to Texaco at \$125 a share.

SMITH: So it was significant.

WILLIAMS: Very significant.

SMITH: Did you have to convince Gordon? I mean it doesn't sound like you would have to.

WILLIAMS: No. I wasn't there, but Marty told me afterwards that Gordon just laughed and said, "Sure!"

SMITH: Though part of his interest, initially at least, seemed to be management control, and not simply money.

WILLIAMS: I never was sure with Gordon. He and I had dinner several times and I



never was sure whether he really wanted to run [Getty Oil], or he was just confident that it wasn't being well run. The two got confused. There were some other people involved, too. I think Gordon was being encouraged to run it, and it scared the hell out of him. But it wasn't being well run.

SMITH: But the company had had a tremendous upsurge not only in revenues but also net profits for several years in a row, so at least the bottom line would indicate that it was doing well. Though I suppose that was a period when all oil companies were doing well. I think this winds up with the museum's assets tripling?

WILLIAMS: We made a profit of just over a billion dollars from the sale.

SMITH: I thought you went from a billion to three billion—from '81 to right after the sale.

WILLIAMS: I'd have to look, I really don't remember.

SMITH: There may be other things that were happening.

WILLIAMS: The market had taken off. I mean, talk about timing. The estate closed, I think in May of '82, and the stock market took off in August of '82, and we did pretty well in our investments in the meantime.

SMITH: Were you anticipating that there would be this jump in the assets as a result of the sale?

WILLIAMS: No. I was just focused on diversification rather than making a lot of money on the sale.



SMITH: Because a key element of the folklore that floats around is that you were a wizard who saw in advance that you could double or triple the museum's assets, and you pulled the strings to allow this to happen.

WILLIAMS: Why should I fight the folklore? [laughter] But basically, it was obvious that if somebody bought us out there would be a premium, as contrasted to just having to do secondary offerings to get out of an existing situation where Gordon owned 40 percent. It was not a grand strategy.

SMITH: So then you have these assets, and you diversify your portfolio. Do you personally attend to managing the J. Paul Getty Trust assets and portfolio? Is that an important part of your day-to-day responsibilities?

WILLIAMS: Not day-to-day. The endowment policy was mine. The selection of the managers is basically mine. The way in which we oversee what they do, which is done by others, I've pretty much set. So I'd say that the essential characteristics are mine, and it's only when markets do unusual things, or the psychology of the market changes, or the behavior of one of our managers changes from what we would normally expect it to be that I get involved. Otherwise, I leave it alone.

SMITH: But the trust's assets have continued to grow because the stock market has grown.

WILLIAMS: Yes, it's a wonderful market.

SMITH: It also seems that the trust was not adversely affected by the '87 plunge.

WILLIAMS: No.

SMITH: Was that because of decisions that you had made?

WILLIAMS: We were rocked by it, but not terribly, for two reasons: one was the asset allocation itself, and two, we were pretty conservatively positioned, so that we weren't exposed to the kinds of risks that gave rise to the '87 problems. We felt some of the consequences, but we weren't exposed, particularly.

SMITH: In talking to various people, I have gotten the impression that as a nonprofit organization, the Getty Trust acts in a slightly more aggressive way than most of the other trust funds do; you don't stick to as conservative an interpretation of prudent management.

WILLIAMS: I don't know. I think we're very conservative. I wouldn't agree with that. Maybe we have better managers. But I don't think our risk profile is higher than it is with other large endowments. Now, a typical university will spend a smaller percentage of the value of its endowment than we do, but that's in the nature of a university, where the endowment plays a different role than it does with us. The university has other sources of revenues, and they'll typically spend 4½, maybe 5 percent of the market value of the endowment, sometimes less. The University of California is spending 4½ percent. We spend 5½ percent.

SMITH: Of course, isn't part of that connected to your building campaign, or is that separate?



WILLIAMS: That's apart from the building campaign.

SMITH: Partly I ask these questions because what you can do is shaped to a degree by your assets.

WILLIAMS: Oh, totally. When I'm asked whether the Getty today is what I visualized it to be in '82, the answer is no. There I was looking at an institution with an endowment of a billion dollars. Today we're an endowment of four billion dollars, and we've spent three billion dollars in the meantime.

SMITH: Three billion?

WILLIAMS: Yes, so it's a very different place. More in magnitude than anything else. Back in '82, we visualized that we wanted everything together in one place, but we didn't visualize it would be this. The programs are in the very areas we talked about, although they've evolved and they're organized and contributing in different ways than we may have visualized. The areas of focus are what we talked about back then, but it's on a much larger scale.

SMITH: Before we get on to that, to what degree did your position at Norton Simon, or at the SEC prepare you for the situation at the Getty and the quick decision-making that had to be done in order to maximize the opportunities? You had been involved obviously from the other side in take-over, in conflicts with managers who, like the Getty Oil managers, did not want to be taken over.

WILLIAMS: You know, in a very strange sort of way it all seemed to come



together, as though it was part of a plan. My first experience in managing investments was in the late 1950s, when I managed a convertible bond portfolio, and then I managed another portfolio later on. So I have understood markets from early on, and I did a decent job of investing. Norton used to criticize me for being slow to make decisions, and I always disagreed with him. I said, "Norton, no decision is a decision, so far as I'm concerned." So I'm always making decisions. At some point I know that it's time to make a decision rather than to accept no decision as the decision, and it's a judgment call as to when the balance shifts, when you either know enough to make a decision, or a sense of urgency says you've got to make one even if you don't know enough. There are a lot of factors that go into it.

At [UCLA], one of my major innovations, which showed up in the course materials, was the recognition that a major problem with business schools is that everything becomes statistical and everything becomes something that can be computerized. But big decisions can't be computerized; they all involve a leap of faith or a judgment call, and you've got to learn how to make decisions on inadequate information. But it does take a certain kind of confidence to do it, and I guess mine has risen over the years. Sometimes I just know I've got to move. But I recognize that I'll adjust as I go along.

I start down a course because I think that's the right direction to go. I don't know where the hell I'm going to end up, but I'll feel my way, because I know I've got



to move and that's the right direction. That's what was involved in the sale of the Getty Oil stock. Ultimately something was going to come out of this. It wasn't a grand vision that I was going to make a potful of money out of it; it was just that I had to extricate the trust and this seemed to be the direction to move.

Certainly, both at the company and at the SEC I experienced the philosophy and the tactics of takeovers—as somebody involved in taking over, as an observer, and as a cop on the scene, to some extent. But also, my development as a manager was such that I didn't know enough or have enough confidence about the areas I have been involved in to be an autocrat. I've had to surround myself with confident people who knew a lot more about it than I did, but with whom I could interact. Through an ability to learn, and I think a pretty inquiring broad-gauged mind and a quick learning curve, I could challenge and lead. I found when I got to the university that that was the only way to move ahead, and certainly that was true with the [SEC] as well, to provide leadership in contexts where you had to motivate people by stimulating them intellectually, by challenging them, by encouraging them, by providing a vision that they could buy into. It all kind of came together here at the Getty in different ways. And with a lot of luck.

SMITH: After the Texaco buyout, and the trust is extricated from its relationship with Getty Oil, did the nature of your relationship with the board of trustees change?

WILLIAMS: It changed with Harold, certainly. But generally speaking, the board's



been terrific. They have been totally supportive. No, I don't think it changed after that. It could have, and I worried about that a little, because another board might have said, "What the hell are you doing out there?" It might have been too late to stop me, but they could have tried to rein me in after that in different ways. I guess it would be fair to say I have really run this place.

SMITH: Well, they did hire you to be the CEO.

WILLIAMS: I've tried not to get *too* far ahead of the board, but I have been ahead of them, and it's been shaped. But they've never challenged me with a budget I've presented. They voted me down on one thing in the years I've been here, and that happened when I first brought the Giambologna sculpture to their attention. They said no. But I came back to the next meeting and they said yes. Otherwise, they haven't denied me anything I've asked for.

SMITH: Is this in part because they are a passive board, or is it because you take their education as being essential to management?

WILLIAMS: If there's a passivity, I think that's a consequence. I think I've tried to keep them informed, I've tried to keep them engaged and educated. And as I've said to them, they're the continuity. And, selfishly, if something really goes sour—I've seen this happen in the corporate world—and you don't keep your board engaged with you, and supportive and understanding, then you get into trouble. The next thing you know you're fired—or at least the board separates themselves from you. So

1. The first part of the document discusses the importance of maintaining accurate records of all transactions and activities. It emphasizes the need for transparency and accountability in financial reporting.

2. The second part of the document outlines the various methods and techniques used to collect and analyze data. It includes a detailed description of the experimental procedures and the statistical analysis performed.

3. The third part of the document presents the results of the study. It includes a series of tables and graphs that illustrate the findings of the research. The data shows a clear trend of increasing activity over time.

4. The fourth part of the document discusses the implications of the findings. It suggests that the results have significant implications for the field of study and may lead to further research in this area.

5. The fifth part of the document concludes the study. It summarizes the main findings and provides a final statement on the importance of the research.

I reckon I've got to keep my board with me. I think beyond that we've done well enough. This has been an upbeat place, so the board's been upbeat with it. They've shared in the enthusiasm and they think the Getty Center's wonderful. They see the significance of a lot of the things we're doing, and they bask in the glory of it, the common sense of accomplishment. It's been that kind of place. So as a result, yes, they may have been passive by consequence, but not because they're naturally passive people.

SMITH: But for those at least who are business persons, they didn't have a financial interest that would be motivating their attention. This is public service for them.

WILLIAMS: That's true.

SMITH: You decided to expand the board after the Texaco buy out.

WILLIAMS: I think some of that started even before.

SMITH: What were your concerns about the size of the board, and who did you want to be on the board? How did you envision the representation of the trusteeship?

WILLIAMS: Well, there were a number of things involved. Franklin Murphy came on the board when I did, but a number of the trustees didn't bring much to the party, and that concerned me. It concerned me that they didn't even understand enough to ask me good questions or be understandably supportive of what we were doing. They didn't represent us well to the community, and they were getting old, or some of them were. So my objective was to broaden perspectives on the board, bring in

1. The first part of the document discusses the importance of maintaining accurate records of all transactions and activities. It emphasizes the need for transparency and accountability in financial reporting.

2. The second part of the document outlines the various methods and techniques used to collect and analyze data. It includes a detailed description of the experimental procedures and the statistical analysis performed.

3. The third part of the document presents the results of the study. It includes a series of tables and graphs that illustrate the findings of the research. The data shows a clear trend of increasing activity over time.

4. The fourth part of the document discusses the implications of the findings. It suggests that the results have significant implications for the field of study and may lead to further research in this area.

5. The fifth part of the document concludes the study. It summarizes the main findings and provides a final statement on the importance of the research.

people who had had experience in the nonprofit sector, people who would bring investment expertise, people who had some perspective on the arts and humanities. What you do, typically, is bring in people you know. Both because you know them, so you know what their interests are, and also because you are comfortable with them and they with you.

So I started bringing some people on, and the next thing I did was work to get some age and term limits introduced, which we were able to do. We established seventy-two as the age limit, but grandfathered the existing trustees who were over age seventy to age seventy-five. Term limits have changed, but they are now set at three four-year terms—not more than twelve years of service. Again, we ignored the years of service up to that time and started fresh, politically, in order to get the thing going.

SMITH: Was there resistance from some members of the board?

WILLIAMS: There was some reluctance, but I think one of the keys to its success was Gordon saying it was a good idea. And Franklin, who was already seventy or so, also said it was a good idea. The two represented the old guard, in a sense. There was Gordon, and who had a more vested interest in being on the board than Gordon? And Franklin was one of the leaders of the elderly. So, it went through, but as I say, we had to do some grandfathering to get it done. Of course, now my concern is that there'll be nobody left with a real institutional memory of where we came from.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO
DEPARTMENT OF THE HISTORY OF ARTS
AND ARCHITECTURE
1100 EAST 58TH STREET
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60637
TEL: 773-936-5000
FAX: 773-936-5001
WWW.HA.UCHICAGO.EDU

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO
DEPARTMENT OF THE HISTORY OF ARTS
AND ARCHITECTURE
1100 EAST 58TH STREET
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60637
TEL: 773-936-5000
FAX: 773-936-5001
WWW.HA.UCHICAGO.EDU

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO
DEPARTMENT OF THE HISTORY OF ARTS
AND ARCHITECTURE
1100 EAST 58TH STREET
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60637
TEL: 773-936-5000
FAX: 773-936-5001
WWW.HA.UCHICAGO.EDU

SMITH: That happens, inevitably.

WILLIAMS: That's right, that's right. But the institutional memory will disappear at the same time a new chief executive comes in.

SMITH: In terms of your own role, did you view the board of trustees as a body that you would turn to for advice, or as a group of disengaged or semidisengaged people who could then view objectively and dispassionately your explanations?

WILLIAMS: The latter.

SMITH: So the Getty Trust would be self-managing, rather than directed by the board?

WILLIAMS: Right.

SMITH: I understand that many museums suffer from the problem of an over-involved board, particularly in Los Angeles.

WILLIAMS: They select board members for different reasons—for their collections, or their money, or whatever, and that's not our objective. I've noticed that boards tend to look at managements of nonprofits differently than they look at managements of for-profits. They tend to think of them as not very professional, not very good managers; they're really hired hands. Obviously, that's not the way I've behaved. But you see that all around us, and it's aggravated when trustees are experts in art, or perceive themselves to be so because they're collectors, or because they're going to give a lot of money or have given a lot of money to institutions; they feel entitled to



certain prerogatives that go with that.

SMITH: One issue, then we can probably wrap this up and go to lunch, is that you requested the resignation of Federico Zeri. Could you explain why you decided this was necessary?

WILLIAMS: This all relates to the Getty kouros, this questionable piece of sculpture. The inquiry into whether the kouros was genuine, whether we should acquire it, went on for two years, involving everything from aesthetic to iconographic to scientific research. The file must be six inches thick. There were experts from all over the world. Zeri felt the kouros was a fake. We finally concluded that we were going to buy it, and we did buy it. Then I got a transcript of a television program in Italy in which Zeri, without naming the museum or the piece, but the reference was pretty obvious, talked about how he'd encountered an obvious fake. He said he had told everybody it was an obvious fake, but the staff was inexperienced, and they went ahead and bought it. So I called Federico and said, "Look, at trustees meetings I really value differences of opinion and the wise counsel of all the trustees, but the one thing we can't have is our decision-making disagreements in the press, particularly when it's disparaging of something that we've done, and I accept your resignation."

Zeri has never forgiven me for this, and he makes a comment about it any time he can. He's a very egotistical person. A brilliant man, an encyclopedic memory, and excellent aesthetic taste, but an enormous ego, and that was probably as big an affront



to his ego as he might have experienced. There was one other trustee, Ronald Getty, who missed a series of meetings, and at the next annual meeting I suggested, in view of his absence and his lack of interest, that he should not be reelected, and he wasn't.

SMITH: But other than those two examples, has the board been helpful? Do you think you get enough of an argument from them on issues, or enough resistance?

WILLIAMS: It varies, it varies. I got a lot of engagement on the opening of the Getty Center, all kinds of questions, concerns, advice, and so forth, yet they're not experts in the areas we're involved in. We use visiting committees, I think very effectively, and what I've tried to do is bring expertise to bear. But you don't bring it to bear necessarily on the board; you don't have someone on the board who becomes anointed as the expert in A, B, or C, because there's more than one perspective on expertise. So you try to do that through the visiting committees, where you can bring a variety of views to bear. If the visiting committees understand that they have a substantive role, that we do count on them to challenge us and to help us shape the institution, they can be very effective. That's not the role of the board.

[Tape III, Side One]

SMITH: Let's go back to the summer of '81, when you presented to the board your plan of spending the next twelve months researching and brainstorming and coming back to them the following May of '82 with a plan. You've hired Nancy Englander and Lani Lattin Duke. Was it difficult to convince Duke to leave her job?

1. The first part of the report deals with the general situation of the country and the progress of the work during the year. It is divided into two main sections: the first section deals with the general situation of the country and the progress of the work during the year, and the second section deals with the results of the work during the year.

2. The second part of the report deals with the results of the work during the year. It is divided into two main sections: the first section deals with the results of the work during the year, and the second section deals with the results of the work during the year.

3. The third part of the report deals with the results of the work during the year. It is divided into two main sections: the first section deals with the results of the work during the year, and the second section deals with the results of the work during the year.

4. The fourth part of the report deals with the results of the work during the year. It is divided into two main sections: the first section deals with the results of the work during the year, and the second section deals with the results of the work during the year.

5. The fifth part of the report deals with the results of the work during the year. It is divided into two main sections: the first section deals with the results of the work during the year, and the second section deals with the results of the work during the year.

6. The sixth part of the report deals with the results of the work during the year. It is divided into two main sections: the first section deals with the results of the work during the year, and the second section deals with the results of the work during the year.

7. The seventh part of the report deals with the results of the work during the year. It is divided into two main sections: the first section deals with the results of the work during the year, and the second section deals with the results of the work during the year.

8. The eighth part of the report deals with the results of the work during the year. It is divided into two main sections: the first section deals with the results of the work during the year, and the second section deals with the results of the work during the year.

9. The ninth part of the report deals with the results of the work during the year. It is divided into two main sections: the first section deals with the results of the work during the year, and the second section deals with the results of the work during the year.

10. The tenth part of the report deals with the results of the work during the year. It is divided into two main sections: the first section deals with the results of the work during the year, and the second section deals with the results of the work during the year.

WILLIAMS: Not really. But I didn't realize at the time, when Lani is thinking about something and trying to understand something, she gets a real frown on her face. I remember sitting with her in some kind of restaurant, or maybe it was a hotel bar or something. The two of us were sitting at a table, and I had interviewed her and then offered her the job. And there was a frown on her face. As I say, at the time I didn't know what it meant. It was a reaction, in a sense. I mean, she was thinking seriously about it, but I didn't know whether to read her expression as something very negative or what. She didn't say yes at that moment; she called me back a couple of days later and agreed to do it.

SMITH: So you sit down in May or June to think about what you're going to do. I guess at this time you already have a museum, and I think the idea of a humanities institute had been floating about.

WILLIAMS: Not as an institute as such, but something in the humanities, something broader than just a museum.

SMITH: Was there also the idea of getting involved in conservation?

WILLIAMS: No.

SMITH: No. So it was just basically those two ideas. Something like the National Gallery and CASVA [Center for Advanced Study in the Visual Arts]?

WILLIAMS: That I think was the model.

SMITH: So how did the three of you set out to define the problem and what you

1. The first part of the report discusses the importance of maintaining accurate records of all transactions. It emphasizes that proper record-keeping is essential for the integrity of the financial system and for the ability to detect and prevent fraud.

2. The second part of the report describes the various methods used to collect and analyze data. It includes a detailed discussion of the sampling techniques employed and the statistical methods used to interpret the results.

3. The third part of the report presents the findings of the study. It shows that there is a significant correlation between the variables studied, and that the results are consistent with the hypotheses proposed.

4. The fourth part of the report discusses the implications of the findings for policy and practice. It suggests that the results of the study can be used to improve the efficiency of the financial system and to reduce the risk of fraud.

5. The fifth part of the report concludes the study and provides a summary of the key findings. It also includes a list of references and a list of figures and tables.

ought to do?

WILLIAMS: I'm trying to remember. It's really hard to bring it all back. Basically, I think the way we charted it out initially was by subject. Lani would look at education, and Nancy would look at the humanities aspect, they'd both look at museums, and I'd be all over the place. We would try to find out who we ought to be talking to. I don't remember in detail how that progressed, but they'd talk to one person, and we'd get some information, and that person would then say, "You ought to talk to so-and-so." It sort of grew the way a tree grows, in a sense. I don't remember anything more specific than that though.

SMITH: There's a whole set of issues concerning the museum, but let's start with this idea of the humanities, because that would have been a new initiative, and you didn't have to deal with anything in place. I thought Otto Wittmann had written up some kind of memo about developing a humanities wing attached to the museum.

WILLIAMS: And Franklin wrote something on the humanities as well.

SMITH: Were these documents helpful?

WILLIAMS: I think they were helpful in a number of ways. Franklin's paper existed before I came, really. It was part of that dialogue he was having with the trustees in which I surfaced, but it was helpful primarily in the sense that the trustees agreed that the place would be more than a museum. Which was the only reason I was interested in the offer. So it legitimized something that intrigued me and made it worthwhile my

1. The first part of the document is a letter from the President of the United States to the Congress, dated January 1, 1801. It is a very important document, as it is the first time that the President has addressed the Congress since the establishment of the office. The letter is written in a very formal and dignified style, and it contains many important points. The President begins by expressing his gratitude to the Congress for the honor of the office, and then he proceeds to discuss the state of the Union. He mentions the progress of the government, the state of the finances, and the state of the military. He also mentions the state of the relations with foreign countries, and he expresses his confidence in the future of the country. The letter is a very important document, as it is the first time that the President has addressed the Congress since the establishment of the office. It is a very formal and dignified style, and it contains many important points. The President begins by expressing his gratitude to the Congress for the honor of the office, and then he proceeds to discuss the state of the Union. He mentions the progress of the government, the state of the finances, and the state of the military. He also mentions the state of the relations with foreign countries, and he expresses his confidence in the future of the country.

2. The second part of the document is a letter from the President to the Congress, dated January 1, 1801. It is a very important document, as it is the first time that the President has addressed the Congress since the establishment of the office. The letter is written in a very formal and dignified style, and it contains many important points. The President begins by expressing his gratitude to the Congress for the honor of the office, and then he proceeds to discuss the state of the Union. He mentions the progress of the government, the state of the finances, and the state of the military. He also mentions the state of the relations with foreign countries, and he expresses his confidence in the future of the country. The letter is a very important document, as it is the first time that the President has addressed the Congress since the establishment of the office. It is a very formal and dignified style, and it contains many important points. The President begins by expressing his gratitude to the Congress for the honor of the office, and then he proceeds to discuss the state of the Union. He mentions the progress of the government, the state of the finances, and the state of the military. He also mentions the state of the relations with foreign countries, and he expresses his confidence in the future of the country.

3. The third part of the document is a letter from the President to the Congress, dated January 1, 1801. It is a very important document, as it is the first time that the President has addressed the Congress since the establishment of the office. The letter is written in a very formal and dignified style, and it contains many important points. The President begins by expressing his gratitude to the Congress for the honor of the office, and then he proceeds to discuss the state of the Union. He mentions the progress of the government, the state of the finances, and the state of the military. He also mentions the state of the relations with foreign countries, and he expresses his confidence in the future of the country. The letter is a very important document, as it is the first time that the President has addressed the Congress since the establishment of the office. It is a very formal and dignified style, and it contains many important points. The President begins by expressing his gratitude to the Congress for the honor of the office, and then he proceeds to discuss the state of the Union. He mentions the progress of the government, the state of the finances, and the state of the military. He also mentions the state of the relations with foreign countries, and he expresses his confidence in the future of the country.

coming. It didn't provide me direction beyond that. Franklin acknowledges that we took it in directions and degrees that he couldn't imagine. But, initially, Lani and Nancy—in the humanities area it was primarily Nancy—started traveling around interviewing people, talking to people, and reporting back to me or sending me memos, because at that time I was focused more on getting the investment side in order. They began to flush people that were worth having a second talk with, or were people that I should meet.

SMITH: So Nancy would do the first set of talks.

WILLIAMS: Yes. And then she brought some people out, or we went out to interview people.

SMITH: Now, you have people like André Chastel, who would not likely be someone you could entice to come to the Getty to take over a program, and then you might have somebody not so well known, who's actually a dreamer. I shouldn't say Chastel wasn't a dreamer, but someone like Kurt Forster, who eventually was the person to launch the humanities program, might be more difficult to identify.

WILLIAMS: Well, Kurt we didn't identify until quite a bit later. But we began to identify some people in the States, and then in Europe, and talked with a number of them, and some of them ended up being on our first advisory committees. Irving Lavin, at Princeton, and his wife were out here for some other reason, and Nancy, Lani, and I had lunch with the two of them. It was my first exposure to Irving. I



remember Nancy and I being up in Boston, and I think we probably interviewed almost the entire art history faculty at Harvard. We talked to Seymour Slive, Oleg Grabar, Jim [James] Ackerman, and a number of others. We visited Irving Lavin in Princeton, and then Nancy spent a fair amount of time in Europe and identified some people there. We saw Hubert Landais at the Louvre, André Chastel, Jacques Thuillier, and a number of others. I spent a fair amount of time alone in London. It was the second time around, but without Nancy. I remember John Hale and Ernst Gombrich. I was asking dumb questions, in a sense, just trying to explore. We spent some time in Italy, but not as much, and a fair amount of time in Germany. We met Willibald Sauerländer early on, and a number of others whom I don't recall.

SMITH: As models you had CASVA, and aspects of the Institute for Advanced Study [Princeton], the Zentralinstitut [Berlin], the Courtauld and Warburg Institutes [London], and you are talking to everybody, but how are you sifting through these slightly different or maybe radically different approaches?

WILLIAMS: They were all different, and none of them were arts and humanities. I had started off with the view early on that if it was going to be humanities it needed to be *arts* and humanities, because we were an arts institution, number one. Number two, I felt from early on that the nexus of the two was really where the action was, and where the real meaning and understanding of art and the history of art would come into play. I realized that each of these institutions had its own characteristics.

Source: *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 1997, 92, 1039-1052.

CASVA was very eastern corridor, and very American. The [Bibliotheca] Hertziana was very German and very passive—just a place where people came to do their own thing. That didn't appeal. The Warburg had some of the same characteristics—too much dedicated to Aby Warburg. The Institute for Advanced Study I think is an anachronism in many ways. The idea of lifetime tenure for a limited number of people just didn't sit well with me. There weren't many places that were proactive; they were passive repositories where people would come to do their own thing.

SMITH: But of course from the academic point of view, if you're a scholar and you get a year off, you're supposed to use it to produce something, and you may not get credit from the university if you've been involved in a collective project.

WILLIAMS: Exactly, that's true, but that's what made our vision unique. There was no point to creating another passive research institution. To call it arts and humanities wouldn't mean anything unless it had something thematic or something proactive about it.

SMITH: You can have a theme of course, but still you have this tension that the people are coming with a sense that they've got to produce their own piece of research.

WILLIAMS: Yes, and you can't really fight that. But if you organize around themes, you can try to get them involved in an environment that they all intersect with, each with a narrow and particular slice at it. They may not even have heard of each other,



let alone been exposed to each other's work, but that circumstance could result in a very rich and lively environment.

SMITH: So you were going around and getting the sense that these places were too passive.

WILLIAMS: The real question was, what could we do that would make a difference? Early on, I said, "Look, our founder's dead. We don't have to please him. We're not a government agency, so we don't have to be populist. We don't have a corporation whose image we have to worry about. We can take some risks, we can make mistakes, we can make long-term commitments, and we have a lot of money in a field that's rather impoverished. What can we do that's going to make a difference?" That's where we started. The term I used was "interstices." Where are the interstices? Let's go out and find them and see if there's anything we can do to bridge them. That's where it came from.

SMITH: So the May, '82 presentation to the board of directors included this conception of an arts and humanities center that would be organized around themes and would bring scholars together to discuss common problems from different perspectives. Did everybody like that idea?

WILLIAMS: Yes. And we also said we're going to have a conservation institute. My original thought was that we ought to train new conservators. But I soon realized, yes, there aren't enough conservators, but it's not a matter of supply, it's a

1. The first part of the paper discusses the importance of the study of the history of the United States. It is argued that the study of the history of the United States is essential for a full understanding of the country and its people. The paper then discusses the various methods used by historians to study the past, including the use of primary and secondary sources, and the importance of critical thinking in the study of history.

2. The second part of the paper discusses the role of the federal government in the development of the United States. It is argued that the federal government has played a central role in the development of the country, and that its actions have shaped the course of American history. The paper then discusses the various policies and programs of the federal government, and the impact of these policies on the country.

3. The third part of the paper discusses the role of the states in the development of the United States. It is argued that the states have played a central role in the development of the country, and that their actions have shaped the course of American history. The paper then discusses the various policies and programs of the states, and the impact of these policies on the country.

4. The fourth part of the paper discusses the role of the people in the development of the United States. It is argued that the people have played a central role in the development of the country, and that their actions have shaped the course of American history. The paper then discusses the various policies and programs of the people, and the impact of these policies on the country.

5. The fifth part of the paper discusses the role of the economy in the development of the United States. It is argued that the economy has played a central role in the development of the country, and that its actions have shaped the course of American history. The paper then discusses the various policies and programs of the economy, and the impact of these policies on the country.

6. The sixth part of the paper discusses the role of the culture in the development of the United States. It is argued that the culture has played a central role in the development of the country, and that its actions have shaped the course of American history. The paper then discusses the various policies and programs of the culture, and the impact of these policies on the country.

7. The seventh part of the paper discusses the role of the environment in the development of the United States. It is argued that the environment has played a central role in the development of the country, and that its actions have shaped the course of American history. The paper then discusses the various policies and programs of the environment, and the impact of these policies on the country.

8. The eighth part of the paper discusses the role of the military in the development of the United States. It is argued that the military has played a central role in the development of the country, and that its actions have shaped the course of American history. The paper then discusses the various policies and programs of the military, and the impact of these policies on the country.

9. The ninth part of the paper discusses the role of the education system in the development of the United States. It is argued that the education system has played a central role in the development of the country, and that its actions have shaped the course of American history. The paper then discusses the various policies and programs of the education system, and the impact of these policies on the country.

10. The tenth part of the paper discusses the role of the health care system in the development of the United States. It is argued that the health care system has played a central role in the development of the country, and that its actions have shaped the course of American history. The paper then discusses the various policies and programs of the health care system, and the impact of these policies on the country.

matter of demand. So we gave up on that idea and focused on several other aspects of the field. Conservators are what I call bench people. They're doers; they sit at their bench and do things. But they don't write up what they do; they don't share their experiences, so they can't build on each other's successes and failures. I thought we ought to do something to try to enhance the exchange of information among conservators.

SMITH: At what point did the idea that a conservation institute ought to be included in the program enter into your discussions?

WILLIAMS: It was early.

SMITH: But in that previous year you started out with the humanities proposal and the museum.

WILLIAMS: The conservation idea was connected to the museum to begin with, because, basically, when we initially thought of a conservation institute it was conservation of museum objects.

SMITH: So you weren't thinking yet of going out to Rome or Egypt?

WILLIAMS: It's a lot more extensive now than what we anticipated. But it was in that context, in visiting museums particularly, and visiting some places that were doing things in conservation, like the Doerner Institute in Munich, that we began to realize there was a lot that needed to be done. Also, as we began to explore the field of conservation, the differences in approach between Europe and the United States



became apparent, and these differences were manifested in several ways. European conservators typically were trained as apprentices, with the focus on the object. In this country they tended to go through training programs, and it was more professional training, which in some respects tended to get more removed from the objects as such, or not as directly engaged with objects.

Also, and this is oversimplified, there was a rift between hands-on conservators, particularly European, and those who were being trained scientifically, which was tending to happen in the United States, in those training programs—with a different focus on where art fit in. The Europeans were saying that scientific training was focused more on science than on the object, and it was too far removed from a real understanding of the object itself and its history, why it was painted, its context, and all that, and therefore things were happening to paintings that shouldn't happen. So the conservation field was polarized, yet there wasn't a lot of really good scientific research and application going on. The only research of any consequence that seemed to be going on was at the Doerner in Munich. We felt that we could do something in scientific research, but do it differently, with the object as the centrality.

As I said, we weren't going to train new conservators, but there was the need for a sharing of knowledge, which was just a matter of exchange of information, and beyond that there was a lot of need in various parts of the world for more formal advanced training to take conservators from where they were to where they ought to

1. The first part of the document discusses the importance of maintaining accurate records of all transactions and activities. It emphasizes the need for transparency and accountability in financial reporting.

2. The second part of the document outlines the various methods and techniques used to collect and analyze data. It includes a detailed description of the experimental procedures and the statistical analysis performed.

3. The third part of the document presents the results of the study. It includes a series of tables and graphs that illustrate the findings of the research. The data shows a clear trend of increasing activity over time.

4. The fourth part of the document discusses the implications of the findings. It suggests that the results have significant implications for the field of study and may lead to further research in this area.

5. The fifth part of the document concludes the study. It summarizes the main findings and provides a final statement on the importance of the research.

be. And that's there we started, with a scientific research facility and an exchange of information and training. Actually, I hired the person who would head up our scientific research area even before we got approval for the institute, and I parked him at the museum. I hired him from the Doerner in Munich.

SMITH: And who was that?

WILLIAMS: Frank Preusser, who is no longer with us. So that was how that area got started.

SMITH: So at that point you didn't necessarily know what the scope of the conservation program or the institute might be?

WILLIAMS: Well, I didn't know what the scope of any of them was going to be, ultimately. They're all different from what they were when we started. In a way, the research institute is probably less different than the others, but they've all changed in very important ways. There were all kinds of things beginning to happen in the application of computer technology, and we saw that fitting into the museum and research worlds. Again, the original concept, which was different from what we ended up with, was to design a prototype of what could be done to harness the power of the computer and computer technology in the interests of art and the history of art. But, in a sense, we took the biggest risk seeing if we could do anything about art education. Art in the schools at that time was not viewed as substantive. It was therapeutic, or it was a frill.



SMITH: In this country.

WILLIAMS: Or it was "expressive," or whatever, but that was the one area we considered to be the most risky. All the others were risky, but they were risky because they hadn't been done. In art education there was active resistance to the idea that art education could be anything substantive.

SMITH: Resistance from the educational community?

WILLIAMS: The education community, from school boards who were pressed with tight budgets. The whole perception of art was something that kids did for their entertainment.

SMITH: The model that you developed there seems to be quite similar to the model used to train kids in France in the visual arts.

WILLIAMS: Is that right?

SMITH: At least it strikes me that way.

WILLIAMS: I'm not familiar with it. But when we started work on it, we found that there was this theory out there, advocating substantive education, taught sequentially, K through 12, with a respectable body of literature and some respectable proponents. So we said, "Let's give it a shot."

SMITH: But, in that case, didn't you have the difficulty that even if it proved to be wonderful and successful, how were the school boards going to pay for it?

WILLIAMS: Sure. And we still fight that, because there are counter pressures out



of the business community for math and science to be competitive with the rest of the world. We don't look at how we're doing at art compared to other countries, but we certainly do look at math and science. Oh, it's uphill, it still is.

SMITH: It sounds like your initial two areas that you were thinking about, art and the humanities, quickly within that year multiplied to a half dozen programs which then would be organized into three major units and some ancillary programs.

WILLIAMS: I don't remember how we labeled them, but they would each be their own thing. We did not conceive of some being major and others ancillary, except that the museum, already existing and being Mr. Getty's creation, would receive more resources, particularly for acquisitions.

SMITH: So you were a corporate and government executive, Nancy was an arts administrator, and Lani Lattin Duke was an arts advocate.

WILLIAMS: With some government and Hill experience, yes.

SMITH: But none of you actually had any hands-on experience, or anything that could even be close to expertise in any of the areas.

WILLIAMS: No. That's right.

SMITH: When you were talking to people like Irving Lavin, or Willibald Sauerländer, what do you think they were looking to get out of this? Why should they share their opinions with you?

WILLIAMS: I think it was two things. One, we did have a lot of money, and so



there was an opportunity there to influence how it was spent; we were going to spend it somehow. And two, they really took to Nancy, and then to me, in the sense that they thought we were unusual people, and people who you could say—this is self-serving—might really be able to do something, and we were nice people to work with. I think that's what it was, basically. And they brought a lot to us. To have an advisory committee, as we then called it, with Lavin and Sauerländer and Landais and Slive and Craig [Hugh] Smyth brought legitimacy to the research institute. These were established, respected names in the field. Literally, they were our key to legitimacy, not only in the research institute, but even more broadly. If these people would associate with us, then we must be okay.

SMITH: Who were the people that you were assembling in an advisory capacity for the conservation institute?

WILLIAMS: Who was the initial group there? I've got to dig it out.

SMITH: Well, it's on record already anyway.

WILLIAMS: But that came a little later, and the information institute as well came later. The first thing we focused on in terms of implementation was the research institute.

SMITH: Or, as it was called then, the [Getty] Center.

WILLIAMS: The Getty Center for the History of Art and the Humanities [now the Getty Research Institute for the History of Art and the Humanities]. And it was



Willibald Sauerländer who said Kurt Forster was a guy we ought to meet. I hadn't even heard of him.

SMITH: Well, there was no reason why you would have heard of him.

WILLIAMS: No. He was then at Stanford, so Nancy and I made an appointment to fly up and talk to him.

SMITH: Now, he's told me that he had no idea that you were interested in him coming to work.

WILLIAMS: No, we were just continuing our exploration; that was our interview technique, you know.

SMITH: When you did go to talk to him, did you make that appointment with the idea that he might be the right person?

WILLIAMS: Yes. At that time we were beginning to look for someone to head up the Getty Center, but, obviously, it's not the kind of thing you disclose too early.

SMITH: In terms of who you were looking for, what were the kinds of alternative perspectives or imaginations that you were considering? If you want to name names, that's fine.

WILLIAMS: There wasn't a lot of imagination out there. One person we talked to was Sauerländer himself, but he wasn't prepared to come to the United States. He is a very able man, with a lot of wisdom and a lot of breadth. He's elderly, but he's contemporary. We were having a hard time picking a person in each of the areas, but

1. The first part of the document discusses the importance of maintaining accurate records of all transactions and activities. It emphasizes the need for transparency and accountability in financial reporting.

2. The second part of the document outlines the various methods and techniques used to collect and analyze data. It includes a detailed description of the experimental procedures and the statistical analysis performed.

3. The third part of the document presents the results of the study. It includes a series of tables and graphs that illustrate the findings of the research. The data shows a clear trend of increasing activity over time.

4. The fourth part of the document discusses the implications of the findings. It suggests that the results have significant implications for the field of research and may lead to further developments in the future.

5. The fifth part of the document concludes the study. It summarizes the main findings and provides a final statement on the importance of the research.

in that case we wanted somebody who bridged the arts and humanities, but who was lively and imaginative and creative and irreverent and not just an established figure who was going to create another institute. We talked to Hank [Henry A.] Millon at CASVA about it and he turned us down. I'm glad he did; it would have been a mistake, because Hank is too traditional and too tired. Kurt was terrific.

SMITH: So when you sat down to talk with him the first time, you wanted to get a sense of him as a person, but what did you present to him as the reason for talking to him, and what did he give back to you?

WILLIAMS: Well, we wanted to create this institute. What should it be? What kinds of things should we be considering? I don't remember the dialogue, particularly, but that's basically the way that we presented it. We were creating this center, we had a name for it, but we were still exploring what shape it should take, and how we could make a significant contribution. I know we were impressed by his answers, but I don't remember what they were.

SMITH: Did it take much to convince him to leave Stanford and come down here?

WILLIAMS: He left Stanford and then went to MIT [Massachusetts Institute of Technology]. When would this have been? I'm trying to remember when Kurt joined us.

SMITH: Let's see. As you can guess, I have a chronology here. It's '84. Though of course the decision might have been made the year before.

[Faint, illegible text lines, likely bleed-through from the reverse side of the page]

WILLIAMS: We had talked to him, it seems to me, in the Spring of '83, and then he left Stanford and went to MIT. It would have been late in '83, I guess, when we approached him. I don't recall it as being a belabored kind of decision. But as I recall he did finish the academic year.

SMITH: Was Françoise [Forster-Hahn] already at Riverside?

WILLIAMS: Françoise was at Riverside.

SMITH: So that would have been a plus.

WILLIAMS: Yes.

SMITH: Now, one of the issues of course was that you were running an operation that was academic, but also a business. Not a business to make profit, but you had to be responsible. Many academics are not necessarily capable of crossing both bridges, so how were you thinking through this issue of corporate responsibility while promoting imagination and creativity? How were you going to balance the tensions between letting people explore and not allowing initiatives that weren't going to produce much go too far? Or was that a worry for you?

WILLIAMS: We could take risks on not producing much. I can't say that I really thought that way or defined the problem that way, although it's a natural way to define it, but I really understood the problem because I was dealing with it. Basically, we started off with a fairly good conceptual or philosophical understanding of what it was that each of these programs was meant to accomplish: what was the mission,



could the individual truly buy into the mission, and was this someone who would bring imagination to it and had the capacity to implement it? These were people with what I used to call "big motors," which is what I wanted. But, also, I thought they would be good people, so you didn't have to rely on a lot of paper to develop understanding or trust.

But very few of them, if any, understood a damn thing about administration or management. None of them were managers. So we did several things, and some they chafed under. One of course was the annual program planning and budget. Both aspects were important: the program plan in terms of how it fit with our agreed upon mission, and the budget in terms of how you were going to spend your money within the limited number of dollars you had. Secondly, with each of the programs we brought in someone whose talent was administration. Hopefully and ideally it was someone with some degree of related substantive appreciation, knowledge, and understanding. As a result, we have a number of graduates of the UCLA arts management program. Now, Kurt used to talk about the "corporate environment," and I don't know whether it was because I came out of the corporate world initially, or because Joe [Joseph] Kearns, who is pretty tough at a lot of things, is clearly out of the corporate world, or whether it was just a way of putting a label on the constraints.

In many ways, of course, faculty at the universities are basically insulated from the equivalent. At the university, I always worked within budgets and all kinds of



constraints, policy wise and procedure wise, but the faculty was pretty well insulated from it. They knew it was there, they saw it in limited resources, but they didn't have to deal with the cause of the effect, so to speak, and in fact I never did learn UCLA's policies. I had a very able administrative person there, and I said, "Suzy, just keep me out of trouble, let me know when I'm going off the deep end," and I kept going from there.

But the people here were all recruited because they were very creative, and when you are dealing with very creative people who want to do all kinds of things, to some extent when they bump into constraints, they chafe under them. Me too, so I understand it well. I think it's a natural kind of condition. I didn't clearly define it that way, I just knew it, so we strived at trying to make it work. I've never tried to make managers out of these people. At times it's created some real problems. Kurt in some ways is very inspirational, but in other ways he was very intolerant of people. He obviously didn't suffer fools, but even apart from that, there were drones and there were leading scholars. If you weren't a leading scholar you were a drone and were treated accordingly. You were there to serve. But that's not much different from any other academic environment, which in many ways is what we are.

SMITH: The budgeting process seems different, because in most universities, probably all universities I know of, it's basically rollover, and you fight over whether it's going to be 1.2 or 1.4.



WILLIAMS: The budget process is different, because there is a central purpose to each of the programs, and the budget process is our once-a-year opportunity to look conceptually at where we are and what we're trying to do, and talk about it; it's been the way we've shaped the institution. So you're right, the budget process itself here is quite different from what you'd find in the university. Obviously, another difference is that we're nowhere near as bottom up, even though a lot of the creativity in how one implements the mission came out of the programs and its leadership, it's not the same as academic departments that sort of do their own thing.

SMITH: No, and you don't have faculty governance, which is also a major difference for people who come from the university, where once you're tenured, you can do pretty much whatever you please.

WILLIAMS: That's right. And that's why, when we talked early on about how many of the people at the research institute should be long term, permanent staff, I said I wanted to keep it at a minimum. Nobody was going to be tenured. I wanted turnover, because that's the way you ventilate the place, and I've tried to live with that.

SMITH: But it does seem you have actually a rather large staff at the research institute.

WILLIAMS: It's grown, and in part I think it's grown of necessity, because we are trying to do more, and you need more permanent staff in order to do more.



SMITH: Part of the idea is to hand collection development over to professional scholars rather than to trained librarians, who are also professionals, but not necessarily scholars.

WILLIAMS: I've never wanted acquisitions to be in the hands of librarians. In fact, early on, there was a lot of suggestion that the library be a separate facility. Even some of the people we talked to when we were exploring who might lead the research institute or how it might be organized urged that we have the library separate. I didn't want to do that, because I didn't like the way university libraries were run. I thought the decisions about the content of the library ought to be made by the users and by the scholars themselves.

SMITH: Kurt is noted for his "tutorial style," to use a phrase that's bandied about often. What about his relationship with you and Nancy? Was there a way in which you were his pupils in this relationship?

WILLIAMS: I've never thought of it that way. No, I felt that we were very much peers, although we both admired him and were very fond of him.

[Tape III, Side Two]

SMITH: There was a certain amount of tension between the research institute and the museum on the one hand and the research institute and AHIP [Art History Information Program, now the Getty Information Institute] on the other hand. To what degree did you foresee that as something that might happen, that the various



units might have competing interests or the leaders might have competing egos, and to what degree could that be transformed into a positive thing, if it could? Surely schools and departments at universities compete with each other.

WILLIAMS: There were different forces at work. Conceptually, we felt from the very beginning that there would be differences. Part of the vision for this place was that its ultimate strengths would come from people from different disciplines, or different parts of the field.

[Tape IV, Side One]

WILLIAMS: You were asking me about the disagreements between programs.

I was starting to say that the purpose of bringing all these programs together was that each of them would develop their own perspective of the aspect of the field in which they were involved. There would be differences of point of view and probably some fundamental differences in philosophy that would need to be confronted. I knew very well that there wasn't a satisfactory working relationship between art history departments and museums in universities. Also, art history departments tend to look down upon art historians who decide to make their careers in museums. Finally, and this relates to my first point, in a typical museum, the philosophy of conservation or research is limited by and subservient to the museum's collection philosophy.

So there was the anticipation that there would be differences, confrontation, and so forth. What I didn't anticipate was the extent to which the personalities of the



directors would conflict with each other. There were some real problems: differences in view of the respective programs, aggravated by the egos of the people involved and their styles of dealing with confrontation. This caused some very contentious times around here and made collaboration or collegial disagreement difficult at times.

SMITH: As personnel turned over, did that then become a new factor in the hiring process for the new director?

WILLIAMS: Yes, but also, certainly in the case of the museum and in the case of the research institute, the attitude of the directors to some extent began to pervade the staffs, and that aggravated things further. So it was a consideration, but it wasn't a primary factor.

SMITH: I don't know if it was formally a zero-based budget kind of process, but it was something similar to that. Did that exacerbate competition?

WILLIAMS: Not overtly, no. I don't know why there hasn't been more competition. For a long time, and this was exacerbated a little by John Walsh, the museum felt that all this money was theirs and that some of it was being taken away from them, the library was theirs and it was taken away from them, and their independence was theirs and it was taken away from them. So the museum has had the attitude of being oppressed and feeling sorry for itself, to some extent. And it has viewed the research institute in particular as a program that has taken things away from it.



But not one of the directors has ever come to me and said, or inferred even, that we could make better use of that money than giving it to so-and-so. I don't know just how to react to that. I suspect in part they probably realized it wouldn't be appreciated, that I was going to make the decisions based on what I considered merit to be. Maybe there was some sense on their part that I was being fair; either that, or I'd made up my mind there was no point to make a big deal out of it.

SMITH: In this initial process, going back to, let's say, '81 to '83, what were the key debates, whether they were external or internal, as to what the best steps would be to building this multitiered organization? By "internal" I mean, really, psychologically internal.

WILLIAMS: I don't know. As I said earlier, I felt given to having a sense of direction, to start moving things along. I was prepared to adjust the direction as I went along, so once we had the marching orders, we just started building the programs, and I put Lani in charge of the education program.

SMITH: Did that peel her off from the overall conceptualization?

WILLIAMS: Yes it did, in part because her largest contribution, and what she seemed to care about and internalize most was education, and she hadn't been that much a contributor to the other aspects. Nancy and I went off to build the rest of the program. In fact, I put Nancy in charge of all three programs, and we just started building them.

1. The first part of the document discusses the importance of maintaining accurate records of all transactions and activities. It emphasizes the need for transparency and accountability in financial reporting.

2. The second part outlines the various methods and techniques used to collect and analyze data. It includes a detailed description of the experimental procedures and the statistical tools employed.

3. The third part presents the results of the study, showing the trends and patterns observed in the data. It includes several tables and graphs to illustrate the findings.

4. The fourth part discusses the implications of the results and provides recommendations for future research. It highlights the areas that need further investigation and the potential applications of the findings.

5. The final part of the document is a conclusion that summarizes the main points of the study and reiterates the significance of the findings.

SMITH: My sense from talking to Nancy was that her interests were really directed towards the research institute, the conservation institute, and the new programs that you were developing, because the museum was basically self-administering.

WILLIAMS: Yes.

SMITH: Not that it didn't require time and effort.

WILLIAMS: No, but that seems right. And while the museum was moving along, we were making some acquisitions, and the next challenge was to get it in shape to get a new director in.

SMITH: So would it be fair to say that you were the one who dealt with the museum, and Nancy dealt with the research institute, the information program, and the conservation institute?

WILLIAMS: Right. And Lani dealt with education and I dealt with the endowment.

SMITH: So in May '82, you present this to the board, and then it's announced to the public that same month as a plan to build three new institutions. You also knew that you were going to have to build a new museum to supplement the one in Malibu. At what point did that become obvious, or was it always obvious?

WILLIAMS: The first thing we did, I think it was after May of '82, was to look at where to put all of this. My first thought was to put it in Malibu. But as we began to look at Malibu and realized what we would have to add there, which was a lot less than what we've actually built here, obviously, apart from the museum, it was clear

1. The first part of the document discusses the importance of maintaining accurate records of all transactions and activities. It emphasizes the need for transparency and accountability in financial reporting.

2. The second part of the document outlines the various methods and techniques used to collect and analyze data. It includes a detailed description of the experimental procedures and the statistical analysis performed.

3. The third part of the document presents the results of the study. It includes a series of tables and graphs that illustrate the findings of the research. The data shows a clear trend of increasing activity over time.

4. The fourth part of the document discusses the implications of the findings. It suggests that the results have significant implications for the field of study and may lead to further research in this area.

5. The fifth part of the document concludes the study. It summarizes the key findings and provides a final statement on the importance of the research.

that we would have difficulty doing it. Even though we had sixty-five acres, it would so overwhelm what was there that it would destroy the ambiance of the place. So we had to start looking for a new place, and it was early in '83 that we bought this piece of property.

Some time in '82 I called somebody I had known from the days before I went to Washington, someone who had retired from Coldwell Banker; he had been in charge of their commercial real estate division. I needed a favor; I needed a map of every parcel of twenty-five acres or more, whether developed or undeveloped, from downtown LA west, that might be acquirable. Some time later he came to me with a map. Among other places there was this site, which I couldn't believe. I looked at a number of properties, and there was nothing downtown but the Ambassador Hotel site. I got into lengthy discussions about that site with David Schine, who had been on McCarthy's staff, during the communist hearings. His father was in the hotel business. They owned the Ambassador Hotel. But I concluded that that was the wrong place, and it was too expensive.

SMITH: You would have had to keep the building, or at least a substantial part of it.

WILLIAMS: We weren't certain of that, but it seemed probable. It would have been a very complicated thing to maintain part of it. Not that this [Brentwood site] wasn't complicated . . . but it was quite expensive, and unrealistic.

After looking at a number of sites, I identified three parcels that could work



for us. One was what is now referred to as the Hughes property, a parcel in Playa del Rey. The part we were looking at was the hill overlooking Slauson, right by the San Diego Freeway. The second possibility was the Veterans' Administration, because that was a time when the Reagan administration was talking about selling off excess government property, and I thought we could generate enough contacts to the president that if that was the site we wanted, we'd stand a chance of getting it. And the third site was this one [Brentwood].

While I'd done a little building in my life, I wanted some outside views and opinions, so we brought Bill Lacy out. Bill had been with the National Endowment for the Humanities, he was an architect by background, and he was president of the Cooper Union in New York. Actually, he was a friend of Nancy's, that's how I got to him. There were two other people whose names I don't recall now. One was a landscape man from the east, and the other was an architect as well, but I'll have to dig out who they were. We invited them out to look at all three properties. We looked at this one last, and when we got up here, they turned to me with a smile on their faces and said, "You were setting us up. How could you consider the other two when you could consider this?" Well, that was my view, but I wasn't setting them up, I really wasn't. I knew, obviously, that this was a wonderfully unique piece of property, but it presented some special difficulties.

We bought the property in three parcels. The one we built on was the first



one we bought, and it was owned by an individual named Tom Jones, who had bought it many years earlier from the widow of one of his closest friends. He bought it from her because she was having cash problems. I don't know how much he paid for it, not a lot. After owning it for many years, he decided he might as well develop it, and he had gone through a lengthy process with lawyers for several years, including battling with the neighbors, before he received permission to build thirty-five homes. That's when we came along. Having a zoning plan on file to authorize thirty-five homes meant, one, that the property was worth more than it would have been otherwise, so it cost us more. Secondly, and more importantly, the neighbors had lost the battle to keep it virgin property. So it then would become a matter of *what* to put up rather than *whether* to put anything up, which was helpful to us. So we bought the first parcel.

Then, as part of his whole effort to get permission to subdivide the property, Jones had given half the property, fifty-three acres, to the University of California as a wildlife preserve. We wanted to buy that property, but I had a problem. I didn't want our interest to be publicly known, at that point at least, because there would probably be other properties that we'd want to buy as well. Plus, I had a conflict: I was a regent of the university. So I went to the president of the university and the general counsel, I told them of our interest, and they talked to UCLA without disclosing who I was. UCLA said they'd love to get rid of the land because it was too



urban to be a wildlife preserve and they'd rather have the money to buy property elsewhere. So, literally, it was put up to bid, and it was a sealed bid, handled by the probate court. We were the prevailing bidder, miles beyond the next bidder. I didn't want to be criticized later and accused of conflict, and I didn't mind if a few extra dollars went to the university in the process. So we bid for that property on the basis that we paid for the first one. We had an outside appraiser come in and appraise the parcel, so we made a bid and we were successful.

Then there's the hill which looks down on us from the north. I sure as hell didn't want some Arab sheik coming along and building a monstrosity on top of that hill overlooking what we were going to build here. That property had been owned for many years by two developers who were both elderly, both very ill, and they had had a falling out and weren't talking to each other. So that was an interesting negotiation, talking to the lawyer of one, the son of the other, trying to put something together, which we finally were able to do. I think we owned all three parcels by the end of '83. We then went about the process of selecting an architect.

SMITH: And the plan is to keep that hill permanently vacant?

WILLIAMS: Yes, it'll be vacant. I am assuming, once everything's settled and the land no longer has any potential negotiating value for us, we will carve out what it is we want and give the rest of it to the Santa Monica Conservancy, with the understanding that it would be maintained in its present state in perpetuity, and would



revert back to us rather than be developed in any way.

SMITH: I do understand there was some dissension on the board over the issue of whether the site should be here or down in the Wilshire corridor.

WILLIAMS: No, there was some mention about it on the board, but the dissension was more in the community, and it still continues: whether this site is elitist, "West LA on a Hill," whether it wouldn't be more accessible if it were downtown, or along the Wilshire corridor, or wherever. Obviously, I don't think so. I think it's much more attractive and much more of an experience for people up here than if we'd just built it in a typical high-rise on Wilshire Boulevard.

SMITH: Well, tomorrow I'll return to some of the new developments, but perhaps we can turn our attention now to the museum. You've already mentioned you knew that you needed to get a new director, which you did. You've alluded before to the decision to expand collecting beyond J. Paul Getty's original three foci, with drawings and with sculpture; it was not exactly a decision, but you took advantage of opportunities. But at a certain point you decided that you need no longer be restricted by what Getty's preferences had been.

WILLIAMS: In part, it was a matter of resources, and we could aspire at least to expand beyond what Mr. Getty had collected. The French furniture and antiquities collections were quite good; there were some good pieces there. But even in those collections Getty had been unwilling to spend a lot of money. In fact, Mr. Getty had



turned down the Getty Bronze before he died, which is the finest antiquities piece that we have. It was bought by the trustees after he died, before I ever got there. The paintings collection was lousy. There were a few good pieces, but most of it was pretty mediocre.

At the same time, one could not build a comprehensive museum any longer. I didn't want to go into twentieth-century art for several reasons: one, it was my view that what is timeless in art takes time to be established and determined, and I thought twentieth-century art was for later. Secondly, there were two other museums that were collecting in twentieth-century art. Really three when you considered the Norton Simon [Museum of Art]. So nobody needed us for that. But regardless of the period, art doesn't manifest itself in just one form, and we could enrich the collection and the understanding of art by complementing the paintings, particularly, with other art forms of a similar period, and that included sculpture and drawings.

SMITH: Which were to be innovations then, really.

WILLIAMS: Yes. One day, before John Walsh joined us, a man walked into my office, introduced himself, and said he had the finest collection of medieval illuminated manuscripts in the world that's in private hands, and he wanted to sell it to us. I didn't know a damn thing about it, so we embarked on a study. It was intriguing, because in western art there were two manifestations, or two bridges in the medieval period: one was ivories, and the other was illuminated manuscripts. I thought it might be an

1. The first part of the paper discusses the importance of maintaining accurate records of all transactions and the role of the auditor in this regard. It also touches upon the need for transparency and accountability in financial reporting.

2. The second part of the paper focuses on the various methods and techniques used by auditors to gather evidence and assess the risk of material misstatement. This includes both traditional and modern auditing approaches.

3. The third part of the paper explores the challenges faced by auditors in the current business environment, such as the increasing complexity of transactions and the growing reliance on technology.

4. The fourth part of the paper discusses the importance of communication and collaboration between auditors and management in ensuring the integrity of the financial statements.

5. The fifth part of the paper concludes with a summary of the key findings and a call to action for the auditing profession to continue to evolve and improve its standards and practices.

interesting acquisition to bridge the two periods.

I turned to a young assistant curator of paintings at the museum and asked him to undertake a study of the collection in the field. I confirmed from him, and from others as well, that this was indeed an outstanding collection that had been put together for the owner by the most distinguished dealer in illuminated manuscripts. I had pretty well decided that we ought to go ahead and try to acquire it. We talked to John Walsh and he thought it was a great idea. So I began a negotiation that lasted probably six months or longer before we arrived at a price that we were willing to pay. One of the criteria, in whatever area of collecting we were looking to expand, was the possibility for building a significant collection, even though it could not be comprehensive. In drawings and sculpture we felt that there was the possibility; illuminated manuscripts would be very difficult, but buying a core like that made a difference. And we've added to it since.

Even though we don't collect twentieth-century art per se, the medium that has probably had the most profound impact on paintings was photography, because you no longer needed paintings to capture realism; it was no longer the strategy. So what would painting become? In many ways this phenomenon triggered all the kinds of abstractionism, in many different forms. We were able, through John Walsh, to work with a dealer in New York who got an option, without disclosing our interest, on six or seven of the best collections in private hands in the world, which we then



purchased in one move, and this became a significant factor in collecting in the history of photography, which, again, we've continued to build on.

Thom Kren, the assistant curator who'd done the study on manuscripts, is now our curator of manuscripts. He was offered the opportunity to become curator of paintings at the Cleveland Museum [of Art] and he turned it down to stay here with us. John Walsh was able to recruit Weston Naef from the Metropolitan, who is one of the leading curators, if not *the* leading curator of photography. And that's pretty much the scope of the collection today.

SMITH: You weren't hired as an art expert, and as I recall, you said that you really had only a general knowledge of art, but, nonetheless, it sounds like that was not a case where your experts came and proposed something; you yourself actually had a conception of what the museum could be.

WILLIAMS: Yes, that's true. In a sense, when you put it that way, I'd say the same thing is true of the other acquisitions as well, the Giambologna and the Rembrandt. One doesn't buy a single drawing as an end in itself, but on the basis that it would complement our Rembrandt paintings. But also there was the possibility that one could complement more broadly the paintings collection by outstanding examples of drawings of the same periods. This applied to sculpture and decorative arts as well; it's too sterile and out of context to just have paintings hanging on the wall.

SMITH: You also obviously had to have been involved in the major painting



acquisitions, as well as antiquities acquisitions. The amount of money alone would require you to be more than just the person who finally approved it. Has the process of acquisition always come through the curators or the director of the museum?

WILLIAMS: Basically. Early on, both to learn, and also because I didn't feel that the museum had geared itself up to acquire, I spent time visiting dealers. I'd say there are a fair number of pieces in the collection that I saw first. But I didn't buy any of them, I just told the curator to go and look at them and we would see. It's not my province to buy paintings or buy art objects. It is my province to be convinced, in terms of everything, about why something fits with the collection and why we should buy the piece. How do we know it's authentic? Why is the price reasonable? There have been instances, as with the manuscripts, where, because of the complexity of the transaction, I took on the negotiation for it. But that's rare.

SMITH: In that case, were there benchmarks for knowing what the price might be?

WILLIAMS: That's very difficult with paintings. You reach for other sales and try to assess the relevance or comparability of price, but no two paintings, even by the same artist, are alike. It's difficult to know. You draw a certain amount of comfort at auction when you lose a painting. Also at auction, when you've won, you know at least there's an underbidder, so there's somebody else who might have been as wrong as you, but who thought it was worth close to what you bid.

SMITH: How did you decide to handle the auction process—deciding what the



maximum bid might be?

WILLIAMS: There are several aspects to that. One, we decide what we think is appropriate to pay for a piece, and that's as far as we go. We don't want to be visible at an auction, so we always have somebody bid for us. But we ran a stretch there, I think it was three times in very short sequence to each other, that we were successful bidders at our last bid, and that got me suspicious. It's too unusual to be that lucky or that wise that your last bid would be enough to buy the painting. So we changed our procedure, and even though we still used outsiders, rather than telling the outsider in advance of the auction what our maximum bid was, we changed our procedure so that our representative would be in the audience and when that item came up for bid, somebody would walk over to him and hand him a catalog which contained a notation of our maximum bid. So even our own representative wouldn't know until the very last minute. Then it stopped happening. It may be strictly coincidence, and probably was, but, anyway.

SMITH: What a painting is worth in that case is really a subjective thing: what it's worth to the trust.

WILLIAMS: It's always subjective, to a great extent. Again, you know what other paintings might have sold for at auction in a given period of time, or what we've paid in a private transaction for other things. It's very rough, it's very difficult to know. And it all depends on the economy. Are people feeling flush? Are the Japanese in the



market? Has a museum been able to entice a wealthy patron? There are only a limited number of potential purchases for art objects of the quality and cost that we are interested in acquiring.

SMITH: I don't know what you paid for the van Gogh *Irises*, I didn't find any public record of it.

WILLIAMS: There isn't any.

SMITH: But everybody knows that it was sold at auction six years earlier for over fifty million dollars, so would that be an indicator of how important it was to have a van Gogh?

WILLIAMS: No. We paid much less than fifty million dollars for the van Gogh. It was the most complicated purchase we made. It's probably a longer story than It's worth telling at this point, but while [Alan] Bond paid, I think, fifty-three million, something like that for it, the auction house lent him half the money.

SMITH: Oh, I remember that.

WILLIAMS: Or it was something like half. Then he got into financial trouble and couldn't come up with the money. He was actually going bankrupt, and Sotheby's then was stuck with a very embarrassing situation. They came to us with the suggestion that we buy it, and of course we had the money. Not only did they come to us because we could buy it, but it was important to them to try to assuage the situation by placing the painting in a reputable public collection. So we began a price



negotiation that was lengthy. But then Bond, in his financial shenanigans, had the painting moved around through probably half a dozen or more different Bond entities in as many different countries. We ended up having lawyers in New York, Switzerland, Hong Kong, Singapore, Australia, and New Zealand, and I don't know where else. I was working at home, and everything was getting faxed in to me and to our lawyers in New York from all the different places: legal opinions about whether we could get clear title for the time that the painting was in the company in Hong Kong, or wherever, because of the bankruptcy, and negotiating the terms with Sotheby's. That was fun; I must have spent a day and a half, it was on a weekend, sitting at my desk at home with the fax machine continually going. I was faxing stuff back out as I raised questions or scratched something out. I think the document to acquire the *Iris*es must be an inch and a half thick.



SESSION TWO: 19 JUNE, 1997

[Tape V, Side One]

SMITH: Yesterday we ended up talking about some of the processes of acquiring paintings. I wanted to ask you, what was your vision of the collection that realistically could be assembled in the 1980s and 1990s? Was there an acquisitions policy that guided what you looked for?

WILLIAMS: There was a policy of sorts. I didn't have a vision for what could be accomplished because I didn't know. As I said yesterday, over time we did outline certain areas in which we would collect. We established the expectation that we were going to collect in quality more than in quantity. The collection would never be comprehensive, so we would therefore just be opportunistic. As we went along, first in paintings and then in each of the other areas, we asked a curator to provide us with a status report or an assessment of what we had and what the big gaps were, and what they saw as our priorities for filling those gaps. But still recognizing that largely if not primarily, this was going to be opportunistic—whatever came along.

SMITH: So I presume you realized you were never going to get a Raphael or a Michelangelo.

WILLIAMS: That's right, that's right.

SMITH: But, on the other hand, you wouldn't know if a [Jacopo] Pontormo, for example, was going to come up.



WILLIAMS: There was no way for us to anticipate the Pontormo. In fact, when the LA County Museum [LACMA] had their exhibition "A Day in the Country," I was walking through it with John Walsh, and there was one painting by van Gogh, and the label said "private collection." I turned to John and said, "Gee, private collection. Is that something we could acquire, or make an approach on?" He said, "Oh no, that's been on permanent loan to a museum and there's no way that it would come into play." It was the *Irises*. So, who was to know? The Pontormo had hung for years in the Metropolitan Museum, and the assumption all along was that it would stay there. But I guess, given the owner's family conditions, and also what's happened to the prices in the marketplace for paintings, suddenly the Pontormo came along. In neither case did we have any reason to anticipate the opportunity to acquire these works.

SMITH: You have markedly increased the holdings in nineteenth-century painting. What kind of discussion developed, in thinking about whether you should, for example, get the Ensor, or the Munch?

WILLIAMS: Well, we recognized that we were practically void of nineteenth-century paintings. It was too important a period, so we made it a priority, recognizing that there was a limited availability and also that the prices were steep. Again, it was just a matter of being opportunistic. Even before John came, we bought a Gauguin. I guess the curatorial judgment at the time was that it was good enough for the collection, but then when John and the new curator came in they didn't think



so, so we traded it out against the purchase of a better Gauguin. Early on, we knew there was this big hole in the collection, and the nineteenth-century material is still not comprehensive by any means. But we have some nice pieces.

SMITH: One of your persistent problems has been the difficulty of getting things out of Britain, or getting British export licenses.

WILLIAMS: Yes, right.

SMITH: How has that affected the way you've handled purchases? You've had some successes, you've had some misses, but has it changed your operating procedures?

WILLIAMS: Not really. It's caused the British to change theirs. They are interpreting their own export rules a lot more loosely at this point, to prevent things from leaving. They are reinterpreting, or from our standpoint misinterpreting their own rules. We've had some interesting experiences there. There was a painting by Duccio, which at one point we thought was attributed to somebody else, which was offered to the National Gallery for something like four million pounds. They turned it down, it was offered to us, and we negotiated on it for some time. I think—don't hold me precisely to the numbers—we got it down to something like 2.7 million pounds, at which point there was a stop put on it, and the National Gallery bought it at 2.7, so we negotiated a better price for them. But we've had modest success out of the UK. There have been some major pieces that we wanted which we didn't get, obviously. We've had some problems in France, not as visible, or as many, but the



French have their own ways of dealing with things. We could have had a wonderful Monet called the *Magpie*, which we negotiated a price on, but then we couldn't get it out. The Louvre bought it, and to add insult to injury, they produced a Monet catalog and this painting was on the cover. But we keep trying. The UK is still one of the primary sources of private collections, you might say.

SMITH: Are there political measures that you can take to address the concerns of the British or the French?

WILLIAMS: Well, when we started out there was a lot of misunderstanding in Britain about what we were about. I made several trips over and met with a succession of ministers of culture, and developed some relationships, but they kept turning over. One or two I still have a relationship with, and that kind of cleared the air in terms of our intentions and motivations. We've stepped down a few times on pieces which really did belong in a certain museum and the museum was interested and able to acquire them. We didn't compete with them.

The press was very negative, initially, but we had a public affairs firm in the UK almost from the beginning, to work on that. Periodically, I've taken the trustees to different places in relation to the work of the Getty, and our first trip was to London. We had several dinners there and met with different people, to clear the air. So I think we've done what we could, politically. Basically, the same thing is true in France. There, again, the ministries turn over pretty quickly, but I had a fair



relationship with Jack Lang. The last minister of culture, before the change in the government in France, awarded me the French Order of Arts and Letters, so the relationship is fairly good.

SMITH: You've also had periodic problems regarding questions of authenticity of pieces. Of course the Getty kouros is the most famous example, but there have also been questions about whether pieces that J. Paul Getty had acquired were what he thought they were. Has this led to changes in procedures to standardize ways of validating authenticity?

WILLIAMS: Not really. I think we do about as careful a job as anyone, and in many instances you end up with a judgment call. But literally from the time I got here, any written recommendation that comes out to acquire a piece of art includes very extensive research into authenticity, provenance, and so forth. There have been a few contentious pieces, like the Dieric Bouts *Annunciation*, for example. There was one Frenchman who made a big deal out of his contention that it was not authentic. But all the experts in the field validated our position that it *was* authentic.

You have the biggest problem in antiquities, both from the standpoint of the legality of the excavation and export, and from the standpoint of authenticity. Certainly the kouros is the cardinal example of that problem. We've turned some things away on both counts, where we weren't sure either of the legitimacy of the excavation of the piece, or its authenticity.



SMITH: How directly do you involve yourself in those questions?

WILLIAMS: Nothing is acquired without my review and approval, and how deeply I get into it varies from object to object.

SMITH: At this point the kouros, for example, is still an imponderable.

WILLIAMS: Oh, yes.

SMITH: But what's your hunch on it, having listened to all the various scholarly opinions?

WILLIAMS: Well, we went so far as to hold a conference in Athens, which I attended, and we listened to all the experts on both sides. It was a remarkable experience, in a way. I felt that we were using contemporary frameworks and attributing those to antiquity, as though in ancient Greece, where kouroi were being produced, there was a standard against which they were to be judged, and if a piece didn't fit the standard, somehow it would be destroyed. Everyone was saying, "Now, the feet have to be like so." Come on. So I was not impressed by the critics. I came away from that meeting recognizing that the conflict about authenticity was wide, and there were eminent views on both sides of the issue, but those who opposed authenticity to me were not convincing. Even before I went to the conference I had the view that if it's not authentic, then obviously we've overpaid terribly for it, but, on the other hand, being authentic or not does not affect its beauty. I think it's still a beautiful piece.



SMITH: What have you learned about acquisitions in the past seventeen years?

WILLIAMS: One of the most important things I learned came right out of the kouros acquisition. When the kouros came up, I was pressing on provenance, where has it been and so forth, and our curator came up with a very impressive provenance of where it had been for a number of years. I said, "There's enough money in this thing that a lot of people could have gotten paid off along the way." So we actually hired an investigator and a trial lawyer experienced in cross examination, who went over to Europe and interviewed all the people who were still alive who were part of that provenance. They came back and said it looked fine.

After we bought the piece we brought in a new associate curator of antiquities. He was going over the documentation and said, "You know, that phone number doesn't look right on that stationery." We investigated that and sure enough, that telephone exchange came into being well after the date on the letter. So the whole provenance fell apart, ultimately. It was all manufactured. Which taught me that if you press hard enough for provenance, you get it. But I've learned a lot about art in the process. I've learned to trust my sense of smell, even more than I did initially.

SMITH: Meaning?

WILLIAMS: Well, my sense of smell was right with the kouros. The unintended consequence was a phony provenance, but it was my sense of smell that I was leading

The first of these is the fact that the
the second is the fact that the
the third is the fact that the
the fourth is the fact that the
the fifth is the fact that the
the sixth is the fact that the
the seventh is the fact that the
the eighth is the fact that the
the ninth is the fact that the
the tenth is the fact that the
the eleventh is the fact that the
the twelfth is the fact that the
the thirteenth is the fact that the
the fourteenth is the fact that the
the fifteenth is the fact that the
the sixteenth is the fact that the
the seventeenth is the fact that the
the eighteenth is the fact that the
the nineteenth is the fact that the
the twentieth is the fact that the
the twenty-first is the fact that the
the twenty-second is the fact that the
the twenty-third is the fact that the
the twenty-fourth is the fact that the
the twenty-fifth is the fact that the
the twenty-sixth is the fact that the
the twenty-seventh is the fact that the
the twenty-eighth is the fact that the
the twenty-ninth is the fact that the
the thirtieth is the fact that the
the thirty-first is the fact that the
the thirty-second is the fact that the
the thirty-third is the fact that the
the thirty-fourth is the fact that the
the thirty-fifth is the fact that the
the thirty-sixth is the fact that the
the thirty-seventh is the fact that the
the thirty-eighth is the fact that the
the thirty-ninth is the fact that the
the fortieth is the fact that the
the forty-first is the fact that the
the forty-second is the fact that the
the forty-third is the fact that the
the forty-fourth is the fact that the
the forty-fifth is the fact that the
the forty-sixth is the fact that the
the forty-seventh is the fact that the
the forty-eighth is the fact that the
the forty-ninth is the fact that the
the fiftieth is the fact that the
the fifty-first is the fact that the
the fifty-second is the fact that the
the fifty-third is the fact that the
the fifty-fourth is the fact that the
the fifty-fifth is the fact that the
the fifty-sixth is the fact that the
the fifty-seventh is the fact that the
the fifty-eighth is the fact that the
the fifty-ninth is the fact that the
the sixtieth is the fact that the
the sixty-first is the fact that the
the sixty-second is the fact that the
the sixty-third is the fact that the
the sixty-fourth is the fact that the
the sixty-fifth is the fact that the
the sixty-sixth is the fact that the
the sixty-seventh is the fact that the
the sixty-eighth is the fact that the
the sixty-ninth is the fact that the
the seventieth is the fact that the
the seventy-first is the fact that the
the seventy-second is the fact that the
the seventy-third is the fact that the
the seventy-fourth is the fact that the
the seventy-fifth is the fact that the
the seventy-sixth is the fact that the
the seventy-seventh is the fact that the
the seventy-eighth is the fact that the
the seventy-ninth is the fact that the
the eightieth is the fact that the
the eighty-first is the fact that the
the eighty-second is the fact that the
the eighty-third is the fact that the
the eighty-fourth is the fact that the
the eighty-fifth is the fact that the
the eighty-sixth is the fact that the
the eighty-seventh is the fact that the
the eighty-eighth is the fact that the
the eighty-ninth is the fact that the
the ninetieth is the fact that the
the ninety-first is the fact that the
the ninety-second is the fact that the
the ninety-third is the fact that the
the ninety-fourth is the fact that the
the ninety-fifth is the fact that the
the ninety-sixth is the fact that the
the ninety-seventh is the fact that the
the ninety-eighth is the fact that the
the ninety-ninth is the fact that the
the hundredth is the fact that the

with. We had another situation where some wonderful silver out of the Middle East was presented as antiquities silver. I said, "It can't be. It's either fake or there's something else about it." Again, we had documents of export from the Lebanon and everything else. As it turned out, we got to looking into the provenance and it was all fake.

SMITH: This is different from the connoisseur's "eye."

WILLIAMS: Yes.

SMITH: You are using your business experience to make these judgments.

WILLIAMS: Yes, exactly. I can't say I'm a connoisseur, but I think I've looked at enough art, not only ours but others, that I think I've got a pretty fair eye at this point. Not necessarily for authenticity. In other words, I couldn't look at something that came up out of the blue and say, "Gee, that could be a Rembrandt." I just don't know enough to do that. But I think I have enough of an eye at this point in terms of the aesthetics. I've learned a lot. In a way, through acquisitions, I've probably learned more directly about art than through anything else I've done here.

SMITH: Could you compare the Getty, the Norton Simon, and the Armand Hammer collections in terms of what gave each its distinctive character, its strengths and/or weaknesses, particularly in the case of the Hammer collection?

WILLIAMS: The Simon is to me without doubt the outstanding collection put together post World War II, in private hands, anywhere in the world. In my judgment



it's far superior to the Getty. I'd say we have some wonderful pieces, but in terms of piece for piece overall quality, and breadth, the Simon collection is just a major accomplishment. I don't know that I am able to really talk about strengths and weaknesses that well, but whether it's the Renaissance period, or Spanish art, the Goyas and Zurbarans and so forth, or the depth of some of his print collections, or sculpture, or European art through the nineteenth century, the Norton Simon collection is quite an accomplishment. I'd say it's at least as strong in any area that we're in, and stronger in most. Now, they're not into antiquities, but I'm thinking about areas where we both collect. Their Indian collection is very, very good. Although I don't know that much about Indian art, I have enough of a sense of it to realize it's quite a good collection.

The Hammer collection is a very poor third. It's really an ego/vanity collection; it doesn't deserve its own museum by any means. I think the only thing good about the Hammer is the fact that the museum was built and UCLA now has it. When UCLA was about to build the Fowler [Museum of Cultural History], we were major contributors. We gave them two million dollars towards the Fowler. I was pleading with the chancellor to put it on the UCLA property at Wilshire and Veteran, because I felt that UCLA needed two things: first, it needed a presence in the community, because it was too hard to get onto the campus to see things; and second, it's the most relevant collection anywhere in the city in relation to the diverse

[Faint, illegible text lines visible through the paper]

community of Los Angeles. I didn't prevail, obviously. I think the Hammer has given UCLA a presence that it can build on, but it's not a collection.

SMITH: Is the strength of the Simon collection due to Simon's eye?

WILLIAMS: Oh, yes. There was a combination of factors: Norton had an incredible eye, an eye for quality and an eye for audience appeal. I first saw it in the company advertising in the early days when Norton was directly involved. In addition to that, he had an encyclopedic memory, and he would question everyone. He was not averse to calling up an art historian at eleven o'clock at night to pick his brain about a piece of art. At the same time he'd ask the secretary or the janitor what that person thought about a piece of art. He was just continuously questioning and challenging. He didn't have curators; he was his own curator.

SMITH: Did you talk to him when you were considering major acquisitions?

WILLIAMS: No.

SMITH: You never asked his opinion?

WILLIAMS: No.

SMITH: Again, this may fall more into the folklore of things, but there were rumors floating about that at some point the Getty might take over the Simon collection. Did you two discuss the fate of his collection?

WILLIAMS: Endlessly. I felt that the two should be together. I said to Norton early on, "This collection is your immortality, and the best way to assure your immortality



is in the hands of the Getty." Because we could protect the name, we could protect the identity of the collection, and we had the resources to assure its future. We negotiated off and on for years; it was perpetual negotiation, but Norton didn't want to do it. There were days when he wanted to keep exploring it, but it reached a point where I stopped being the pursuer. And then he'd bring it up. I don't think he wanted to let go of the idea, but he didn't want to do it either; he always brought up something new, a new issue to deal with, and obviously it didn't work.

SMITH: I guess it's relatively stable now?

WILLIAMS: It's stable, probably as long as Jennifer's alive, but she's now in her late seventies, and I worry about what will happen when she's gone.

SMITH: How directly involved were you in the hiring of curators?

WILLIAMS: It varied. I was always part of the interview process. There were some instances where I clearly said, "No, this man's not right," but it was not a veto so much as important input. When we were looking for a paintings curator, I was the one who came to John and said, "You ought to consider George [Goldner]. He may have been thinking about it, but he'd never said anything to me. I guess the one I was least involved in was the hiring of Weston Naef. In the other cases I think I was an important part of the process.

SMITH: Though you had been central in the process of acquiring the photography collections, both financially and in deciding that this ought to be a priority.



WILLIAMS: Oh, yes.

SMITH: What have been your favorite Getty exhibits, both in terms of your personal taste, but also in terms of what you thought demonstrated what this institution could do uniquely?

WILLIAMS: Well, there haven't been a lot of exhibitions, and certainly primarily they've been in the paper areas, so far. I guess I'd answer you thematically as much as anything else: the ones that have appealed to me most were the ones that were really geared towards a community. There was *Hidden Witness*, which was photography of Afro-Americans of the 1800s, the Civil War period and through there. There was the manuscript exhibition we did that dealt with primarily with Iranian works. I think the way Marion True put together the [Lawrence and Barbara] Fleischman exhibition was absolutely outstanding. Also, the work that the museum and the conservation institute did together on Nefertari. Those are the exhibits that come to mind most.

SMITH: How did the Fleischman acquisition develop? What were the procedures? That was not a purchase, as I understand.

WILLIAMS: We bought part of the collection, but were given the bulk of it. That's basically attributed to Marion True, to the relationship that she'd cultivated for years. John joined the process and ultimately I did, too. I think the Fleischmans were impressed with the Getty overall, with what would be happening to the villa when we reopened it; it's just a different kind of institution than the Metropolitan, which was



their other likely venue.

SMITH: Did you have a sense that you were competing with the Met in a direct, obvious way?

WILLIAMS: The Met had been wooing the [Fleischmans] for many years. There are several collections they have been wooing, and they've gotten closer to the [Leon] Levy-Shelby White collection. But the Fleischman collection is exemplary; it shows just a great eye. Certainly we felt we were in competition, because the Met tried to hire Marion away from us. Had they been successful, they might have gotten the Fleischman collection along with her.

SMITH: In a situation like that, how do you determine what you are willing to do?

WILLIAMS: To hold Marion?

SMITH: To hold Marion and to get the collection.

WILLIAMS: I didn't know whether we were ever going to get the collection or not. We certainly had exhibited it and published it, and certainly the relationship was a warm one. We were hopeful, but it was one day out of the blue when Larry called Marion and said, "There's something that Barbara and I have been thinking about. We decided we might as well do it in our lifetime and enjoy it, rather than waiting until we're gone." Unfortunately, Larry didn't last very long after that.

As to keeping Marion, I don't remember the precise language at this point, I wish I did, but I was in an acquisitions meeting with Marion, and I'd just learned



about the offer, and I slipped her a long-hand note asking her what she would think about making the villa into a museum of ancient cultures, with her as director. I think that did it, and that's what we're delivering on.

SMITH: Was this an idea that had already been percolating?

WILLIAMS: Sort of, but it wasn't very far along, because we were so involved with *this* [the new Getty Center] that the question of what to do with the villa after the Center opened was something that would come later.

SMITH: That's also an aspect of academia, the intense competition that develops over offers and attempts to steal good people. I don't know, maybe private corporations do the same thing.

WILLIAMS: Differently. But this was an acceleration of an idea rather than creating something out of whole cloth.

SMITH: You're also a person who believes in the need for ventilation in order for the organization to grow and develop in new ways. Of course, you don't want to lose your best people, but at the same time—

WILLIAMS: Oh, we've lost a number of good people. In fact, the museum is the only one of the Getty institutions that hasn't changed directors.

SMITH: At one point John Walsh was at the top of the list for the National Gallery, and you had to decide whether to hold him.

WILLIAMS: Yes, that wasn't easy. But through these past years I had felt that John



was as close to being indispensable as anybody could be, because there are so few museum directors, or potential museum directors who have any sense of connoisseurship. They're not trained that way anymore. For most museums it isn't important because they're not acquiring, particularly. For exhibitions it's nice to be a connoisseur, but it isn't as vital. So I really needed John; I think his indispensability diminishes greatly now with the completion of the Getty Center, because the rate of acquisitions is declining, and will, and other things like education, exhibitions, and so forth, will take on a higher priority.

SMITH: Was this part of a plan? You had thought there would be a burst of acquisitions?

WILLIAMS: Oh, yes, by all means. I had been signaling that for years.

SMITH: Do you feel that the collection now is at a plateau where it stands on its own?

WILLIAMS: I think we'll continue to acquire, but at a much slower pace; it'll play a much lesser role. It's always good to acquire a piece or two to pique public interest and keep your curators interested. But it's a respectable collection; it's not going to depend for its future on acquisition.

SMITH: In terms of the curators, how important was the Jiří Frel scandal in terms of changing the operating procedures of the Getty? I guess he was a holdover from the previous period?



WILLIAMS: Yes. I don't think we changed our operating procedures very much. It was an unfortunate circumstance, obviously. Well, it did change procedures in two areas: it changed our procedures in terms of acceptance of gifts, and in antiquities we were much more careful about acquisitions after that. Fortunately, we got through that period with a lot less damage than we could have, both in terms of public image and possibly even in terms of problems with the IRS.

SMITH: From having talked to a number of people in the field, I understand that while what Frel was involved in might have been on the extreme end, it was still nonetheless a pretty common practice for museum curators of the postwar period in general.

WILLIAMS: I don't know. I didn't have that impression, frankly. I think it's certainly more possible in the antiquities world. But I'm sure there were opportunities for kickbacks and other things of that sort to curators, and it's conceivable that it still happens.

SMITH: Yes. Over-valuation in particular was an endemic problem.

WILLIAMS: On acquisitions, on gifts—oh, yes, that was very common. In fact, Frel should have stopped that before we let him go, because I made the rules very clear, that we don't give appraisals at all, that if anybody wanted to give us a gift, they got their own appraisal from someone other than us. But the other area, really, was kickbacks. There's still that opportunity, depending on the kind of dealers you're

1. The first part of the paper discusses the importance of maintaining accurate records of all transactions. It emphasizes that proper record-keeping is essential for the integrity of the financial system and for the ability to detect and prevent fraud.

2. The second part of the paper examines the various methods used to collect and analyze data. It compares different techniques and discusses their strengths and weaknesses. The author argues that a combination of methods is often the most effective way to gather reliable information.

3. The third part of the paper focuses on the challenges of data analysis. It discusses the difficulties of interpreting large amounts of data and the importance of using statistical methods to draw valid conclusions. The author also discusses the need for transparency in the analysis process.

4. The fourth part of the paper discusses the ethical implications of data collection and analysis. It argues that researchers have a responsibility to protect the privacy of the individuals whose data they are using and to use the data only for the purposes for which it was collected.

5. The fifth part of the paper discusses the future of data collection and analysis. It discusses the potential of new technologies to improve data collection and analysis and the need for continued research in this area.

doing business with. We had very tight policies on gifts to curators and to others. We have our annual disclosure statements. Now, could somebody be lying about them? Possibly. But I watch for things like lifestyle and so forth, to see if there's anything untoward, or at least not consistent with what we're paying and the behavior we expect of our people.

SMITH: Again, something you learned from the business world.

WILLIAMS: You look at what kind of cars people are driving.

SMITH: Do you have anything you'd like to add about the museum? There may undoubtedly be things that are important that I've left out. I don't think we need to go into individual purchases, unless there are interesting stories you'd like to relate.

WILLIAMS: We touched on the *Irises* and we touched on the kouros.

SMITH: De-accessioning is generally considered a no-no in the museum field, and I guess you've aggressively de-accessioned at the Getty.

WILLIAMS: Some people say you shouldn't de-accession at all.

[Tape V, Side Two]

WILLIAMS: On the subject of de-accessioning, important collections have been disassembled in order to pay for a new roof, or whatever. I think that that may be the reality and the necessity for a number of arts organizations and a number of museums. Unfortunate, but true. In our case, obviously, that isn't and wasn't the situation. We always de-accession for one of two reasons. In a few instances, as with the Gauguin I



mentioned, in effect we were upgrading, getting a better piece of work by the same artist from the same period. The one we could acquire was much better, and we could trade the one we owned in against the price of the other one.

SMITH: Now, why wouldn't you want both?

WILLIAMS: Because we don't have that kind of collection; we're not trying to create a comprehensive collection. We do want our resources to be more encompassing than comprehensive, or in depth. The second reason for de-accessioning is that Mr. Getty, early on, when he was opening Malibu, really went out and bought just a lot of stuff to put on the walls. They're not the kinds of things that are up to our acquisitions standards or our quality standards, and they're not the kinds of things we're likely to ever want to exhibit. So, rather than just have them sit, better to take the money and buy other things with it. I've argued this in different circles, but museums don't think about the cost of storage; they go ahead and build new space because they've got so much stuff to store, and they've got to take care of it and everything else. In some instances it can be an important study collection, but a lot of the time it's just a matter of holding on to a lot of *stuff*. It's better to either sell it, or give it to other museums, at least on long-term loans, where they can be exhibited and shown to people.

SMITH: How active are you in the National Association of Museum Directors?

WILLIAMS: Not at all.



SMITH: Why is that?

WILLIAMS: It's John's world, not mine.

SMITH: Oh, okay.

WILLIAMS: No, I give speeches, and I am on the President's Committee on the Arts and the Humanities. I was the keynote speaker last week, at the national convention of the American Institute of Conservation. So I do speak to these organizations, but I'm not active in them as such. Whatever activity I have tends to be more targeted to places where I can have some leverage by saying something. I don't give talks unless I've got something to say. I'm known for my "kill the messenger" talks. If people invite me to talk they're going to hear something. They might not like it, they probably won't.

SMITH: But they invite you.

WILLIAMS: They invite me.

SMITH: Of course, some of that might be out of awe and respect for the wealth that you represent.

WILLIAMS: Oh, undoubtedly. In some ways they are inviting the position.

SMITH: I wanted to move into the research institute. There is an ancillary issue which is the question of the research institute's acquisition of modern art objects, which went beyond simply collecting papers and drawings. The Fluxus collections involved a densely-packed roomful of objects that at this point most people would



consider art, though not everybody. I would imagine that you had to personally approve them, not only because of the money involved but also because of the policy issues. What led you to decide, "Okay, the museum's not twentieth century, but the research institute can selectively acquire in twentieth-century work."?

WILLIAMS: Well, I think the research institute is becoming a very important place for the study of twentieth-century art, so certain kinds of accumulations or collections I think would be particularly important in the context of research on twentieth-century art. I think our material on German expressionist art and Russian art is becoming quite important. There's a legitimate distinction there between what one exhibits in the museum as a piece of art and what one acquires for its importance in the total research context. Keeping some of these collections together as bodies of research materials I think could be important. It really is a case of one and one equaling three. As a collection these things have a much greater importance as a research resource than they would if they were disassembled and lost their totality. In many ways, the Archives of the History of Art, as we call them, comprise the true uniqueness of the research institute. Sure, it's one thing to have 750,000 volumes, that's pretty impressive on its own, but those volumes can be found elsewhere as well, although not in one place. It's the collection and preservation and accessibility of this ephemeral material that I think really creates a unique opportunity for scholars.

SMITH: This was very much a collective effort, but a lot of the initiative came from



Mel [J. M.] Edelstein.

WILLIAMS: Yes.

SMITH: I don't know to what degree Kurt was really actively involved in that aspect of the research institute's activities.

WILLIAMS: I think it meant a lot to Kurt. I think he brought Mel in for that purpose. It was meaningful to Kurt, probably the German material particularly.

SMITH: The DDR material, or the German expressionist?

WILLIAMS: The German expressionist material. But of course it can become endless. I talked with Mel often about this, and I still talk to Salvatore [Settis] and his people. I don't want to create a market for material for which there would not otherwise be a market.

SMITH: In terms of purchases?

WILLIAMS: Yes. We are a logical repository because we can take care of these things and make them available; it isn't like a lot of universities where they get the material and put it in the basement. We shouldn't have to pay for it. So that's a continuing struggle.

SMITH: But of course, at least for a period of time, you were actually paying quite large sums of money for these collections.

WILLIAMS: Yes, and to me it got away from us. Some things clearly we had to pay for, and I've no question about it at all. There was no way we could have gotten out

1. The first part of the paper discusses the importance of maintaining accurate records of all transactions. It emphasizes that proper record-keeping is essential for the success of any business or organization. The author argues that without reliable data, decision-making becomes guesswork, which can lead to significant financial losses and operational inefficiencies.

2. The second part of the paper focuses on the challenges of data collection and analysis. It highlights the need for standardized procedures and the use of modern technology to streamline the process. The author suggests that investing in data management systems can significantly reduce the risk of errors and improve the overall quality of the information used for strategic planning.

3. The third part of the paper explores the role of data in marketing and sales. It discusses how companies can use customer data to identify trends, preferences, and potential areas for growth. The author provides several examples of successful marketing campaigns that were based on thorough data analysis, demonstrating the power of data-driven decision-making in the marketplace.

4. The fourth part of the paper addresses the issue of data security and privacy. It notes that as the volume of data collected increases, the risk of data breaches and misuse also increases. The author recommends implementing robust security protocols and ensuring that all data handling practices comply with relevant regulations to protect the integrity and confidentiality of the information.

5. The final part of the paper concludes by summarizing the key points discussed and reiterating the importance of a data-driven approach. The author encourages businesses to embrace data as a valuable asset and to continuously monitor and refine their data management practices to stay competitive in a rapidly changing environment.

of paying for some of the collections we got out of Germany, and they are seminal to the institute at this point. But I have been urging that we back away from purchasing, just to see what we can acquire through donations.

SMITH: Mel was often criticized for having a shotgun approach to collecting, though I think it was also what led to the scope.

WILLIAMS: Sure, sure.

SMITH: That actually represents, I think, a division within the librarian field, or the archival field. If the UCLA library has depth it's because Lawrence Clark Powell was voracious.

WILLIAMS: He defined the playground, in a sense. And I think we probably will do more of that. We have some depth in some areas. I think our festival books have some substantial depth to them. I remember walking through the hall when we were still at 401 Wilshire Boulevard, and I ran into a curator from the Tate Gallery. I said, "What are you doing here?" And she said something to the effect that she was here doing research for an exhibition they were going to mount on German expressionist art. So I said, "I repeat myself. What are you doing here?" And she said, "Well, I couldn't finish my research without coming here."

SMITH: Was German expressionist art an identified target?

WILLIAMS: I think it was more identified. It was opportunistic also, but it was identified. I think in part because of Kurt, in part because Elmar Seibel at Ars Libri,

1. The first part of the document discusses the importance of maintaining accurate records of all transactions and activities. It emphasizes the need for transparency and accountability in financial reporting.

2. The second part of the document outlines the various methods and techniques used to collect and analyze data. It includes a detailed description of the experimental procedures and the statistical analysis performed.

3. The third part of the document presents the results of the study. It includes a series of tables and graphs that illustrate the findings of the research. The data shows a clear trend of increasing activity over time.

4. The fourth part of the document discusses the implications of the findings. It suggests that the results have significant implications for the field of study and may lead to further research in this area.

5. The fifth part of the document concludes the study. It summarizes the main findings and provides a final statement on the importance of the research.

through whom we acquired a lot of material, had a particular presence in Germany and knew the collectors and a lot of the material that was available. I remember Seibel telephoned me one day from Germany about a potential library acquisition. I guess he came to me because of the price, even before he went to Kurt, because there was a sense of urgency; there was a timing issue on the purchase. I called Kurt, and in a matter of an hour we made the deal. There was a storm in the German press about the collection leaving Germany.

SMITH: Did you have a plan in terms of the growth of the library?

WILLIAMS: No. Other than, as I said yesterday, I wanted the library as part of the institute rather than separate.

SMITH: You didn't have some idea of half a million books, or a million books?

WILLIAMS: No. Early on, I had Bob Vospers, at UCLA, prepare for us a kind of overview of the UCLA collections. Except for essential material that you need ready access to, I didn't want to duplicate UCLA, because we had access to that material. I didn't want to build a total corpus of what existed in this geographic area.

SMITH: The other central pillar of the research institute has been the scholars program, which seems to be undergoing change right now. You talked about how you looked at these various models and you came up with a sense of this interaction of art and humanities, and it seemed that you wanted focused projects. But then the implementation of this was up to Kurt and Tom [Reese], and I guess Herb Hymans,



initially. How did you feel about how the scholars program developed and the methods for selecting the scholars, and whether they were working together in a kind of way that you thought could make a difference?

WILLIAMS: I'd say I probably played less of an oversight role there, in part because I knew we'd be doing some experimenting. I think some years seemed to work better than others. I was never happy that we couldn't get far enough ahead of the curve in terms of when we'd send out invitations; we were always planning for next year and always kind of late in getting invitations out, so that often we weren't getting all the people we wanted. I kept wanting to get invitations out a couple of years ahead so that we could have a better shot at getting the people that we wanted. But I like the invitational aspect.

SMITH: As opposed to a competition.

WILLIAMS: Yes.

SMITH: But now the institute seems to be moving towards the idea of competition.

WILLIAMS: It's both; they're looking at it both ways. I understand that, and it could be right. I was a little concerned that the invitational approach tended to be, particularly under Kurt, and to some extent under Salvatore, a matter of "stars" and who you knew.

SMITH: For the junior people, in particular.

WILLIAMS: Yes, and there may be good people out there who we weren't familiar

1. The first part of the paper discusses the importance of maintaining accurate records of all transactions and the role of the auditor in this regard.

2. It then goes on to describe the various methods used to collect and analyze data, including interviews, surveys, and document analysis.

3. The next section presents the results of the study, showing that there is a significant correlation between the quality of the records and the accuracy of the audit.

4. Finally, the paper concludes with a series of recommendations for improving the audit process, such as increasing the transparency of the records and providing more training for auditors.

enough with that we were missing, and we therefore might not be having quite the impact we should. But beyond that, how do you measure what impact we're having? I still don't have the answer to that. There's some anecdotal evidence.

SMITH: Other similar types of centers seem to use the number of publications as their chief measure—books and articles.

WILLIAMS: Yes, but we're not after publications, as such; we're trying to, in a sense, make a cultural difference, and that's harder to measure. But we do have anecdotes of scholars saying, "You really opened my eyes." You know, the talk that says it was a wonderful year because there was all this material and so forth is nice too, that's nice too, but when scholars say the experience here really changed their approach or broadened their thinking or changed the direction of their work, that to me is a lot more meaningful. And we do see that in some of the work that ultimately comes out. Now, Salvatore wants more of a research product, both out of our staff and out of these symposia.

SMITH: A collective product?

WILLIAMS: Yes. We've done a little of that, such as the volume on Dutch life, which was a composite of papers that were put together in the symposia. I think we'll be doing more of that. You'll see more of the evidence, you might say, of the work of the institute.

SMITH: Symposia of shared perspectives is one thing, but to have a collective



project is very different.

WILLIAMS: Yes, it's much too difficult. So I don't know, I think we're still experimenting.

SMITH: It's something they do more frequently in Italy.

WILLIAMS: We heard another complaint from scholars that I used to take seriously, regarding Kurt's absence. In other words, Kurt didn't become an integral part of that intellectual community, and if he had, it could have made a real difference, because he just had that kind of a mind, to really spark the thing. But he wasn't often there.

Salvatore is more there, but I think the addition of Michael Roth could be an important one, because Michael is there often. Now, Michael is not an art historian, but he's got a broad, challenging, inquiring mind, and from the feedback I get, I gather that he does add to the vitality and the intellectual vigor, or whatever you want to call it, of the scholars' year.

SMITH: Was this a source of tension between you and Kurt, his peripatetic schedule?

WILLIAMS: To a degree, although it became complicated with other things, and it became a broader kind of friction, with which I had a lot of sympathy. Kurt, in part because of who he is, but in significant part because he was the director of the research institute, was being asked to do all kinds of things: give speeches, write letters of recommendation, all this kind of stuff. Which he was very conscientious



about wanting to do, but it pulled him away from a lot of the central work of the institute. Also, as I said the other day, he didn't have a lot of patience for the staff as such. And there was this negative perception of the "corporate" business, which I think got in the way and caused friction. We'd talk about all these things, and one thing Kurt wanted less of was the corporate approach. So we just didn't make a lot of progress on that count. But Kurt is a tremendous guy. All in all, he was a great first director for us.

SMITH: Well, you stated yesterday that you wanted people who were dreamers.

WILLIAMS: That's right, and Kurt was terrific. I basically feel that way about every one of the directors we've had. You know, I learned long ago in my managerial life that there is no "managerial style." The responsibility of the manager is to manage the people who are responsible to him in the context of *their* management style, not expect them to all adapt to his management style. I must say that every one of them has their strengths and their weaknesses, as do I, and it's a matter of trying to get the most out of them and enabling them to make the greatest contribution they can.

SMITH: Sometimes that requires positive reinforcement, sometimes negative.

WILLIAMS: Or you shore them up in different ways.

SMITH: This goes back to the UCLA taping that we did, but you had mentioned that Simon had a style of keeping people off kilter.

WILLIAMS: Yes.



SMITH: How did that affect your thinking about the relationships you wanted to have with your people?

WILLIAMS: I don't keep my people off kilter at all. I don't know what they'd say about me. One thing I think they would say is that they'd probably like more of me than they get. But I'm not sure they would really like it if they got it. I'm available to them, but they've got a lot of room to move and to flourish. I said this in the context of our earlier interviews too. I think without exception the directors have achieved beyond their own expectations of what they might achieve; I think they've grown more than they ever would have expected to.

SMITH: What were the circumstances that led to Kurt's decision to resign? Was that entirely personal?

WILLIAMS: It was Kurt's decision entirely. I saw it coming. He took a sabbatical, which he was entitled to, and he kind of never came back. Even when he came back, he didn't come back. I know that after he left he had some regrets about his decision. Right now, and I don't understand the reason for it, there's a real strain between Kurt and the Getty, and I haven't had a chance to catch up with Kurt to find out what that's all about. He feels we've done him in in some way, or not been appropriate, and I don't know what it is; I've got to find out.

SMITH: Then you had to find a replacement. What kinds of discussions took place about the kind of person in general the replacement might be?



WILLIAMS: It was a combination of things. The first thing I did was to write to all the scholars who had been here and ask for their comments about their experience here, how they saw the research institute, how they thought it ought to be different, and any recommendations they had for a successor to Kurt. I got a lot of wonderful responses, wonderful in the sense that people really thought about it. What rang loud and clear was that we were different, and that by and large the difference was very much appreciated. There were some letters, from Americans particularly, who expressed the concern, "Don't get like the eastern corridor. You're really refreshing in this country. Don't change."

I wanted someone who would be respected as a scholar, I wanted an art historian, and I wanted, ideally, someone who had some administrative experience. I concluded early on that I probably didn't want an American, because I didn't want to get caught up in the politics of art history in this country. The research institute had a platform of perceived neutrality or objectivity, and I didn't want to jeopardize that. I looked at Americans, but then it narrowed down to three Europeans: obviously Salvatore Settis, Horst Bredekamp, who is German, now at Humboldt University in Berlin, and an Englishman, John Onians, at East Anglia.

Eventually, we picked Salvatore. Of course, Tom Reese was someone I was looking at seriously, too, because he was acting director, but I felt that Tom didn't have the presence in the field, and he lacked leadership ability. Salvatore had a tough

1. The first part of the document discusses the importance of maintaining accurate records of all transactions and activities. It emphasizes the need for transparency and accountability in financial reporting.

2. The second part outlines the various methods used to collect and analyze data, including surveys, interviews, and focus groups. It also describes the statistical techniques employed to interpret the results.

3. The third part presents the findings of the study, highlighting the key trends and patterns observed. It includes a detailed analysis of the data and a discussion of its implications for the field.

4. The fourth part concludes the document by summarizing the main points and providing recommendations for future research. It also acknowledges the limitations of the study and offers suggestions for addressing them.

5. The final part of the document is a bibliography listing the sources used in the research. It includes books, articles, and other relevant materials that provide context and support for the findings.

transition. Tougher than I anticipated, but I'm not surprised. The stature of a senior respected scholar in Italy is almost . . . there's something autocratic about it. You know: "I'm me!" There was a lack of real understanding of how the American system works, even though Salvatore had been here as a scholar.

SMITH: But he had never taught here.

WILLIAMS: He never taught here. He'd been on the visiting committee for the information institute, and I thought he knew a lot about us. He had a very tough transition. I think he's pretty well made it at this point, but it was very difficult for him. I suspect the next director will be an American, but that will be a few years off, and that's my successor's responsibility.

SMITH: Though you may be around to comment.

WILLIAMS: Yes. I think that also with Salvatore, and Europeans, there's an "old boys club" between all the research institutes: the Hertiana, the Warburg, the Kunsthistorisches Institut, and all the others. I keep reminding Salvatore, "We are not like that, and we're not going to become like that." I think that message got through, and I think he truly appreciates the distinction at this point.

SMITH: So, developing a competitive aspect—

WILLIAMS: As well as a collaborative one, is a way of addressing that issue. You want to collaborate, because there's leverage in the collaboration, but I keep asking Salvatore, "What do we add to it? Is it merely cumulative? Or do we bring a



different perspective to it?" If we don't bring a different perspective, we're wasting our time and resources.

SMITH: Aren't there different conceptions of scholarship on both sides of the Atlantic?

WILLIAMS: Yes.

SMITH: There's the famous Sauerländer anecdote. Erwin Panofsky, who had written all this stuff about how liberating it had been to be in America, in terms of scholarship, then tells Sauerländer that Americans are such barbarians because they think knowledge should always be serving something.

WILLIAMS: Yes, that's right. But, you know, that Sauerländer would pick up that anecdote and carry it tells you about Willibald, and why I would have been happy to see him as director of the research institute.

SMITH: Of course now he's past retirement, I suppose.

WILLIAMS: Yes, too old.

SMITH: Is there anything further you'd like to say about the research institute and its development?

WILLIAMS: I feel quite good about the scholarly resources we're developing. The institute has some personnel problems, but I don't know if those are within the scope of what we're talking about here. It is the most difficult area to assess—whether we're making a significant difference to justify the resources. That has always been a



concern of mine, and I don't know what to do with it.

SMITH: To a certain degree, archival programs tend to become ossified, and the protection of the materials becomes more important than their use; collection itself seems to become a chore rather than an opportunity. I saw this actually happen at UCLA right before my eyes. Of course some of that was budget-related, but I think there are elements of that situation that could apply here.

WILLIAMS: It's something to be deeply concerned about. It hasn't happened here. In fact, to the contrary, they beat on me regularly for more money; their enthusiasm is at a very high level for acquisition. I remind them that each of these acquisitions carries with it an enormous ongoing burden, so we need to pace ourselves and not reach the situation where we're controlled by the collection rather than our controlling the collection.

SMITH: Maybe we should move on to the Getty Conservation Institute. On the surface that area seems more straightforward.

WILLIAMS: Well, its evolution hasn't been straightforward. I described to you yesterday what I considered to be the tensions in the field; consequently, the challenge of finding the first director was not an easy one.

SMITH: You did not hire [Luis] Monreal until '85.

WILLIAMS: Yes. It was very difficult to find the right person. In fact, I was saved from one or two mistakes because people turned me down. I was reaching the point



of wanting to get somebody in to get started and almost made a serious mistake. I did make a serious mistake: I invited someone who I shouldn't have invited. The very reason that that person was wrong was also the reason he turned me down, because he wasn't a venturesome kind of individual—too cautious and conservative.

Nancy found Monreal. He was right because he wasn't a conservator, but he had an interest and a passion for conservation. He had been an objects man as a museum director, and had had organizational experience and skills, and that was positive. His greatest contribution to us was the start-up of the Getty Conservation Institute, although some of it was here when he arrived, number one. Number two, he expanded us into cultural heritage, as contrasted to essentially museum objects, which was where we were starting.

SMITH: Was this something that you needed to be convinced on?

WILLIAMS: Yes. Not that I didn't see the need, but I was concerned about how thin we were spreading ourselves, and whether we could focus enough on something as broad as cultural heritage to make a difference. I had said to the trustees early on, even back in '81, '82, that just in a museum object context we could spend all of our money on conservation without doing anything else. If there's that deep a need, then how do you broaden it out? That took convincing. Luis's biggest negative was his ego, and the extent to which he was inclined to do things for visibility rather than substance. In some instances, both were present, and that was fine. But he did well



for us, he was a good first director.

SMITH: As you assessed the projects that were presented to you, I guess you had an advisory committee to rank things, or give priorities, but now looking back at it, of the projects that were initiated in, say, '85 to '90, which ones seem to you now to be the ones that were really right on the mark, and which ones now seem like they're peripheral to the mission?

WILLIAMS: I don't know that any of them were right on, and none of them were peripheral to the mission as such, really. But we've learned a lot through the years, and that has shaped what we do and how we do it. For example, I think one of the most visible field projects, of course, and in many ways a success story was Nefertari. The problem with Nefertari though, and I realized this when we visited Egypt, was that we didn't have a clear commitment from the Egyptian government as to what they were going to do to conserve it after we were done. This is a problem in every developing country, where the pressure for tourism and hard currency is so great that the minister of tourism has a lot more clout in the government than the minister of culture. I think we've done reasonably well there, but we struggled our way through it without the kind of understanding we should have had going in. I made that clear when I spoke at a dinner we had for the Egyptians; I made their responsibility the theme of my talk, because we hadn't clarified it in advance.

SMITH: But of course that's asking them to either give up or forego as much hard



cash as they can possibly get, or to invest limited resources on something that doesn't feed people or send kids to school.

WILLIAMS: That's right. But as a condition of our coming in and working to conserve something that's an incredible part of their heritage, it was a choice they had to make. It's a problem we have in all developing countries, to one degree or another. Limited resources, limited talent, pressure for hard currency—priorities. We undertook a project on the Sphinx that we shouldn't have. I knew we shouldn't, and I let it happen.

SMITH: Why did you know you shouldn't?

WILLIAMS: I told Monreal, "You're dealing with the national symbol of Egypt, and we're foreigners. There's already enough conflict about what to do with the Sphinx. If anything, we're getting into a buzz saw." And we did. It was aggravated by the fact that we were foreigners, but there was no way to win on the Sphinx, so we ultimately backed away from it. I think the China project is working reasonably well.

SMITH: These are the two grottoes, the Mogao and the Yungang?

WILLIAMS: Yes. We had to back away from Tihuanaco because the Bolivian government wouldn't deliver. What we're doing in Quito, Ecuador, I think is working well, because the government there is delivering. Early on, we set a series of criteria for the kind of projects we'd undertake, and those have been by and large honored. Every once in a while I think we get off the track. But in the last year the



conservation institute regrouped and developed a strategic plan that I think will serve them well; it focuses their efforts more and establishes a tighter set of criteria for deciding how to use their limited resources. I think we've done pretty well in the area of scientific research. I don't think we've published as much as we should on the work we've done. The publication activity has been very slow to come together.

[Tape VI, Side One]

SMITH: With the Laetoli, Tanzania, project you've gone into something which has very little to do with art history.

WILLIAMS: No, that's true, that's true.

SMITH: And that would seem to be spreading your resources thinner and thinner.

WILLIAMS: Well, cultural heritage is not necessarily limited to art history, so that doesn't concern me. What does concern me about Laetoli is whether there's a scientific problem we can break through that's meaningful to other projects. I keep looking for leverage in the projects. If we're successful in this project, does the result carry over into other areas as well, where the experience is relevant? We should train indigenous personnel to work on the project, and if it's the right project, with their experience, they are then available to work on other projects. I don't see the leverage in Laetoli. If we just go out to conserve things that are important, we can go on forever, but there's no leverage in it, so that's an area that I have been concerned about. Laetoli totally got away from me, to put it simply, because there was a lot that



was romantic and urgent about it, and we were unique in our ability to address it.

SMITH: Why are you unique, given that there are international agencies and other national identities that ought to be involved with cultural heritage conservation?

WILLIAMS: There aren't any other agencies effectively working in the field. The UNESCO agencies are doing some things, but they are underfunded and they are bureaucratized, and there's really not much going on. It's a tragedy, but it's true. Now, the best thing that's happening to us at this point is the possibility of a partnership between the Getty and the World Bank—we're talking upwards of 150 million dollars—to fund projects in which a major component is cultural heritage. We would serve as technical advisers, which I think would give us a lot of leverage.

SMITH: And the conservation institute would then manage the projects?

WILLIAMS: No, we'd advise on them, probably. I don't think we'd manage them. But it would not just be the conservation institute; it would involve the research institute as well. So that could be a useful thing to do. We've been tightening up in the conservation institute. There are projects that in some ways I think have become vanity projects rather than projects we should undertake. I would think the new strategic plan would avoid some of those.

SMITH: Montreal left in 1990?

WILLIAMS: About that time, yes.

SMITH: In December, 1990, [Miguel Angel] Corzo is named director, so



presumably he left in that time period. What was the story behind Monreal's decision to leave and the process by which you arrived at Corzo as the successor?

WILLIAMS: Luis is a Catalan, and he always maintained strong relationships back home in Barcelona. His wife is French, and she never adapted to being here. He was offered a wonderful position in Barcelona as head of a new foundation that was being formed by two of the major insurance companies, I guess it was. It was a large foundation with very substantial resources, and it was an attractive thing for him to do. He would be in charge, with no boss.

SMITH: So this was an opportunity for ventilation, which was positive for both sides?

WILLIAMS: Yes.

SMITH: How were you defining who you ought to hire for the replacement?

WILLIAMS: I still wanted somebody who wasn't identified with any of the camps, so to speak, in the field. It's a very international organization, and I wanted somebody who thought internationally. I wanted someone who would be more of a team builder than Luis was, obviously with some experience in and some passion for conservation. We'd had some exposure to Corzo because he'd been a consultant to us and worked on several projects with us. He knew the organization and was respected by the organization. It's a thin field, in terms of people meeting our criteria.

SMITH: Had you thought about promoting from within?



WILLIAMS: Yes. In fact, twice now I have gone to an acting director from within, and I'd say in both instances, when I didn't appoint that person to be the permanent director, it created a problem. Despite my initial cautions and our understanding that I put them in as *acting* directors, it's created a problem. I put Frank Preusser in as acting director of the conservation institute, and he was not the right person to lead it. He then found it very difficult to function under Corzo, and we lost him. He was a very good scientist, but not a people person. And like a lot of scientists, he was not much of a manager. So it didn't work.

SMITH: The architectural preservation program that you initiated in 1988 is something distinct from this.

WILLIAMS: Architectural preservation?

SMITH: Under John Sanday?

WILLIAMS: That's part of the grant program [Getty Grant Program].

SMITH: Oh, okay. Something separate. Well, we'll get to that later. With the development of the new focus for the Malibu campus, do you see, as one part of your thinking, an increasing overlap in function of the museum, the research institute, and the conservation institute? More collaboration?

WILLIAMS: Oh, that's one of the conditions of it, yes. That's what it's supposed to do.

SMITH: But that's an experiment still?



WILLIAMS: Well, the design of the program, the conceptualization of it, was a product of that collaboration. Now, whether they can implement it, we will see.

SMITH: Is there anything further you'd like to add on the conservation institute?

Your assessment, what you've learned, beyond what you've already said?

WILLIAMS: The conservation institute is an example of something else that's happening in many ways throughout the Getty. The summer before last, the museum, in the person primarily of Marion True, who has her relationships with the Mediterranean countries, and the conservation institute held a conference on archaeological conservation, to which representatives of all the Mediterranean countries were invited: government people, museum people, archaeologists—the whole spectrum. It was to be held on a boat that actually traveled to the various sites and looked at the problems presented by the sites.

Every country but Libya participated and sent government representatives. There is no other institution in the world, in my judgment, that could have successfully hosted something like that, which I think is a reflection of several things. It's a reflection, number one, of the credibility we have, and it's also a reflection of how each of the programs, the information institute, education, and conservation, are increasingly becoming party to shaping public policy, and in many ways are catalysts of public policy. And that's an evolution of these programs that I certainly didn't anticipate. I think it's a product of our having established ourselves as professional, as



doers, as collaborators, as people who have a degree of objectivity and caring that's evidenced—and the void in the field.

To me it's a very gratifying thing; there's a lot of leverage in it, potentially. There's some tricky ground in there too, but each of the programs, to some extent, is involved in that way. Least of all the research institute, although as part of the opening year, the institute will host an international conference on the state of art history. Again, the Getty is recognized as probably the only institution that had the credibility to host such a conference, with the expectation that it would be an objective and comprehensive look at the field, and that all points of view would be invited and respected. That's quite an accomplishment.

SMITH: If the Getty moves increasingly towards public policy involvement, doesn't that then require a different kind of personnel, or a different kind of leadership from what one would normally find in an academic or cultural institution?

WILLIAMS: Yes, and to some extent you see that evolving. I think that's an area where Eleanor Fink, for example, in the information institute, does a good job. The education institute just brought in a young man who was a member of the LA Board of Education. It's an area that fits with some of my speech work and activity.

SMITH: The Getty Information Institute, what used to be AHIP, seems to have developed somewhat slowly, and at least from the record it seems that the first movement in that direction is when you get involved with *Avery Index* and then with

1. The first part of the paper discusses the importance of maintaining accurate records of all transactions and the role of the auditor in this regard. It also touches upon the need for transparency and accountability in financial reporting.

2. The second part of the paper focuses on the various methods used to audit financial statements, including the use of sampling techniques and the importance of understanding the internal controls of the entity being audited.

3. The third part of the paper discusses the challenges faced by auditors in the current business environment, such as the increasing complexity of financial transactions and the need for continuous professional development.

4. The fourth part of the paper provides a detailed analysis of the audit process, from the initial planning stage to the final reporting stage, highlighting the key steps and considerations at each stage.

5. The fifth part of the paper discusses the importance of communication between the auditor and the management of the entity being audited, and the role of the auditor in providing constructive feedback to improve the entity's financial reporting.

6. The sixth part of the paper discusses the importance of maintaining independence and objectivity as an auditor, and the various measures that can be taken to ensure this.

7. The seventh part of the paper discusses the importance of maintaining confidentiality and the role of the auditor in protecting the information of the entity being audited.

8. The eighth part of the paper discusses the importance of maintaining a high level of ethical standards as an auditor, and the various measures that can be taken to ensure this.

9. The ninth part of the paper discusses the importance of maintaining a high level of professional competence as an auditor, and the various measures that can be taken to ensure this.

10. The tenth part of the paper discusses the importance of maintaining a high level of integrity as an auditor, and the various measures that can be taken to ensure this.

RILA [*International Repertory of the Literature of Art*]. What led you to decide to subvent these ongoing projects? I know Nancy was involved in both of those projects; were they something that she brought to you as opportunities?

WILLIAMS: Yes, and I'd say in both cases we have saved and nourished very important resources for the field. But I wish I could find an adoptive parent for each of them. To go back to the conservation institute, for example, we established something called the Conservation Information Network. I don't know what the current count is, but it was on line in thirty-five countries, something like that. Once we had it up and going, we were able to get the Canadian Heritage Information Network to take it over so we could free up those resources and go and do something else.

We've put a cap on the amount of money we'll put into the *Avery Index*. We have too much in the way of resources tied up in *RILA*. Actually, we're expanding *RILA*, so in some ways it costs us less, and we have our relationship with the French, which was hard to come by. It must have been '83 or '84 when Nancy and I met with the senior French people about merging our two bibliographies. They wouldn't hear of it, and they wouldn't buy in with us. So we went ahead and just developed ours. Then they came to us a few years later. We've got contributors from other countries involved in it; it's a much larger project than it was when we took it on. As I say, it provides a real service to the field, but we've got to find some ways to reduce our



obligation to it.

Part of the original thinking for AHIP was that we would develop a model of what an art history information network could look like by taking on discrete projects that would kind of hang together on a frame. But that got misperceived as a plan to build a database that would cover all the art of the world. We saw early on that the museums were all developing their own databases that were not compatible with each other, and we thought, wouldn't it be wonderful to be compatible so that we could exchange information? We tried to get that to happen and failed. I think it failed for several reasons: one, museums don't think broadly enough; two, they had too much already invested in their idiosyncratic systems; and three, who the hell is the Getty?

Finally, I guess, AHIP was led by an individual who wasn't a collaborator. I'd say Michael Ester was as close as I came to making a mistake in my choice of first directors. He sounded like he'd be terrific: doctorates in archaeology and computer science. What greater combination? But it really didn't fly. He's the one I asked to leave, and I waited too long to do it. But I've always had this weakness of trying to see if I couldn't turn people around.

SMITH: The problem there was not enough coordination?

WILLIAMS: Not enough leadership, and not enough collaborative instinct, which made it difficult to get going in some of the things we wanted to get going on. And Ester was probably too much interested in the hardware and the actual mechanics,



rather than the bigger picture. On the other hand, his work on digital imaging, which fascinated him, was groundbreaking. But it was premature and somewhat off track for us in terms of what we needed to do. When I started looking for his successor, there was one case where I did stay inside, because I didn't find anyone else that had any promise of being much better. I think Eleanor Fink has done quite well. If anything, she's more attracted to that outside world, that catalytic role, than running the shop, so to speak. As I say, we all have our strengths and weaknesses. But she's done quite a job for us out there, and she's really positioned us. I don't know if you've heard about Object ID, but that's a project we initiated that has now been adopted by UNESCO, Scotland Yard, the FBI, Interpol, and all kinds of international organizations.

SMITH: Oh, the standardized identification for provenance?

WILLIAMS: Right. It facilitates the prompt tracking of stolen objects, but those criteria fit for everything, whether the objects are stolen or not. It's a way of organizing your critical information about objects. It was quite an accomplishment, and it was Eleanor's doing. Also, we represent the United States to the G7 on the information superhighway. So there's another example of public policy being made.

SMITH: There may be major policy issues there that could affect future commitments for the Getty, so are you involved with her in discussing where these things should and should not go?



WILLIAMS: Yes.

SMITH: When you represent the United States in the G7, that becomes a very open ended situation.

WILLIAMS: Watch how sucked-in we get. Yes, that's a concern. But it's contained basically by limitations in the way of resources. Eleanor turns away a lot of things that we could be involved in. She's had to make some pretty critical choices, as have all the directors.

SMITH: Was the Object ID project something that you had to approve up front before it began? I'm trying to get a sense of how deeply you get involved with the management of these things.

WILLIAMS: No, it isn't that formal. I learned early on from Eleanor that she's working on this kind of thing, and I have the opportunity to help shape it or to say forget it, or whatever, but we don't have a formal process whereby Eleanor writes me and says, "I'm thinking of this. Would you approve it?" That applies to all of the Getty programs; the rein is much looser than that.

SMITH: Do you have monthly, or quarterly reports?

WILLIAMS: Basically, at this point, there are quarterly updates on what's happening. But Eleanor will call me periodically, probably more often than once a month, to say she wants to talk to me. We'll talk about whatever she's thinking about, or problems she has, where she thinks she really ought to check in with me. That's

1. The first part of the document discusses the importance of maintaining accurate records of all transactions and activities. It emphasizes the need for transparency and accountability in financial reporting.

2. The second part of the document outlines the various methods and techniques used to collect and analyze data. It includes a detailed description of the experimental procedures and the statistical analysis performed.

3. The third part of the document presents the results of the study. It includes a series of tables and graphs that illustrate the findings of the research. The data shows a clear trend of increasing activity over time.

4. The fourth part of the document discusses the implications of the findings. It suggests that the results have significant implications for the field of study and may lead to further research in this area.

5. The fifth part of the document concludes the study. It summarizes the key findings and provides a final statement on the importance of the research.

basically the way I work with all the programs. I think we know each other well enough that I trust them to come to me when they should, so it's loose. But I won't accept surprises.



SESSION THREE: 20 JUNE, 1997

[Tape VII, Side One]

SMITH: We have a few more programs to go through, and I also wanted to talk somewhat about the building campaign: the selection process, the architect, the kind of structure that you wanted to come up with, the kind of statement that you wanted it to make, and what you had learned from previous building campaigns, particularly in Los Angeles, where you have the not necessarily positive examples of LACMA and what is now the Norton Simon Museum of Art.

WILLIAMS: Okay. So where shall we start?

SMITH: Well, why don't we start with your vision of the complex. Of course you wanted a great piece of architecture, but what kind of feeling did you imagine it conveying, even before you thought about who might do it or what it might look like? What was your sense of the statement that the Getty Center should make?

WILLIAMS: I think we began to shape the statement, if you will, by the acquisition of the property, which in itself had a number of dimensions to it, obviously. One was that it would be high visibility, that it wouldn't be just another high-rise in the middle of the city with all the implications of being just another building. Being close to UCLA was a factor as well, and the ability to build something here that would in its own way engage with and relate to the community because of the views and all. That's as far as it got initially, I'd say.



When it got to the selection of the architect, there were a number of elements at work. I created a selection committee of people who had some insight into architecture and experience with it. For two reasons: I wanted the benefit of that experience, but, frankly, I also wanted to insulate the process from the board, because everybody's an expert on architecture, even though they don't know anything about it, and I didn't want the board involved in that process.

Then we realized that there was no way we could go into a typical competition, where you ask people to give you a design, for several reasons. First of all, we didn't know what we wanted at that point; we weren't shaped enough to be able to give architects a description of what we were or wanted to be. Secondly, it was such an unusual site that, again, we felt it would be inappropriate. So we went the invitational route to a number of firms and asked them if they were interested. We described what the Getty was to become, as we conceived it, and what the site was like. We used a term that was common in the field, which I believe Louis Sullivan introduced; it was, "form to fit function."

SMITH: Form follows function.

WILLIAMS: Yes, and then we invited something like thirty-two firms to tell us (a) were they interested in working with us on such a project, and (b) to indicate why they felt they were qualified to do so. All but one firm responded favorably. We realized early on, when we looked at the firms, that none of them had built on

1. The first part of the paper discusses the importance of maintaining accurate records of all transactions and the role of the auditor in this regard.

2. It then goes on to describe the various methods used to collect and analyze data, including interviews, questionnaires, and archival research.

3. The next section presents the results of the study, which show that there is a significant relationship between the quality of the records and the accuracy of the audit.

4. Finally, the paper concludes with a discussion of the implications of these findings for practice and for future research.

5. The authors suggest that further research should be conducted to explore the factors that influence the quality of the records and to develop strategies to improve them.

6. They also recommend that auditors should be trained to recognize and address the common errors and biases that can occur in the collection and analysis of data.

7. In addition, they suggest that the use of technology can help to improve the accuracy and efficiency of the audit process.

8. Overall, the paper provides a comprehensive overview of the current state of research on the relationship between records and audits, and it offers valuable insights for both researchers and practitioners.

anything other than a city block; none of them had experience building on a hillside. We didn't want somebody that would just flatten out the hillside and build on it; we wanted to retain the positive qualities of the hillside. I don't want to take you through the whole process, though we can talk about it as much as you want to, but ultimately we ended up with three finalists, and the committee presented those three finalists to the board for the board to make the final selection.

They all would have been acceptable in principle. I had reservations about all three; less about Richard [Meier] than the others, and recommended that the board pick Richard, which they did. Conceptually, I think Fumihiko Maki would have designed something very special. He did have a sensitivity to terrain, as was indicated in his work in Japan—not hillside, but terrain. The problem was that the craftsmanship that Maki embraced was of a detail and quality that he could deliver in Japan, but I don't think it could be delivered here. It had a refinement to it that was I think beyond the craftsmen here. Jim Stirling I felt got too gimmicky, but probably could have done a good job for us.

I thought Richard was the right choice on the positive side because he'd done good museums, although Stirling had done museums, too, but also Richard had a passion for art and books. All three of them had another quality that I thought was really vital, and that was an attention to detail that followed through the construction phase. The negative side of Richard was his penchant for white porcelain panels, but



he agreed early on, and was quite eloquent in writing about it, ultimately, that the nature of California—the hillside, the terrain, the light, the color of the soil, etcetera—dictated that there be no white porcelain panels here. So we got over that hump. We didn't begin developing the program until Richard had been hired, because we needed the time to sort of become ourselves, but also we wanted Richard to know and understand what we thought we knew, and didn't know about our own future, so that all that could in some fashion be built into the project.

We started traveling around looking at other museums and gardens and research centers. We'd finished a European tour and were sitting in a conference room at a hotel in Rome, and I started a discussion and asked what was special about Malibu as a museum. We talked about such things as the human scale of the galleries, the inside-outside aspects of it, the gardens and all of that. I felt, and others agreed with me, that visitors to Malibu had a somewhat more intimate experience with the works of art there than they did in a typical museum, and I was trying to capture what that was. Then we got to the question of how to replicate that with a larger museum. Out of that discussion came a concept of what the museum part of the Getty Center should look like. Obviously, it went through a number of iterations before we finalized it, but conceptually it was established right then and there.

The same thing happened later on with the research institute, which was more of an iterative process. Kurt, Tom Reese, and I saw the original design that Richard



came up with and said—particularly Kurt and Tom, me to a far secondary degree—"That's not us; that's not the way we want this thing to live." Out of the various iterations came the design of what is now the research institute.

The site we were building on consisted of two knolls, with a sort of ravine—ravine is too steep a term—in-between the two knolls. It was Richard's idea that the knoll that faced the city and the freeway ought to be the public part of the complex, where the museum belonged, and the knoll that faced the residential community and the ocean was much more contemplative and that's where the research institute ought to be. That was his idea and it made good sense.

The idea of the tram resulted from two concerns: one, we realized early on that we should park the visitors at the bottom of the hill, just at the entrance, but then how do you get them up the hill? The typical thing one does is provide motorized trams up and down, but that can get pretty expensive, and it can be a little hazardous; it's a winding road and there would be enough other traffic, because we were going to have some parking at the top of the hill. We wanted something more imaginative that would be conducive to the kind of experience we wanted visitors to have. It was out of looking at alternatives that we came up with the idea of the tram.

When it came to the gardens, Richard's approach had the same simplicity and rigidity of line, you might say, as his approach to buildings. When Richard does a garden, the trees are all in a row, and they are designed as much as anything else to

1. The first part of the report discusses the importance of maintaining accurate records of all transactions. It emphasizes that this is essential for the company's financial health and for providing reliable information to stakeholders.

2. The second part of the report details the various methods used to collect and analyze data. It includes a description of the sampling process and the statistical techniques employed to interpret the results.

3. The third part of the report presents the findings of the study. It shows that there is a significant correlation between the variables being studied, which supports the hypothesis that was tested.

4. The fourth part of the report discusses the implications of the findings for the company. It suggests that the results can be used to improve internal controls and to make more informed decisions about future operations.

5. The fifth part of the report concludes the study and provides a summary of the key points. It also includes a list of references to the sources used in the research.

complement the architecture. I put it a little differently and said it's more like the setting of a ring, the purpose of the setting being to enhance the jewelry, the jewels being the architecture. Early on, I told Richard that the central garden should be an event unto itself; it should be something very special in the way of a garden that'll be attractive to people, that might even cause them to come to the Getty, and even if they don't come specifically for the garden, they'll be attracted to it and they'll enjoy it. Richard didn't buy into this concept. He kept coming up with designs and I kept saying no.

Finally, one day I called him and said, "Richard, I'm taking the gardens away from you." Which he was not happy about, obviously. I brought Robert Irwin in to design the gardens. Now, that's going to be a sharp edge, because Irwin's approach to art is very different from Richard's. It's much more complex, it's much more colorful; it's just the antithesis of Richard. But, in a way, that's what art is today; it includes a rich diversity of styles, palettes, approaches. So we have two art forms, and they collide, but that's fine. It's going to be very interesting, I think. So those are at least some of the factors that went into the design of this place.

SMITH: In terms of the selection of the architect, what was the balance between a design feel and the more human factors, what the man and his team were like, and whether you felt you could talk to them?

WILLIAMS: Well, the human factor was very important, but in a different way. I



felt we could talk to all three architects. I felt Stirling might be the most difficult. Maki was a joy. And in a way, out of that process, I felt more human rapport with Maki than I did with the other two. It may go back to the fact that I had a lot of Japanese friends as a kid and spent a fair amount of time in the Orient as an adult. I don't know, perhaps it was just chemistry between Maki and me. But neither Maki nor Stirling would make the priority and time commitment to this project that I felt it required. Maki had a big agenda in Japan, including teaching at the university. Stirling was pretty heavily involved in Europe. They were both very reassuring, "Sure, we'll give it the time it needs." But I wasn't very comfortable about that. Richard, on the other hand, said, "I'll move my office out there." That made a difference; we knew that the project would have the kind of attention that it needed to have. I've been asked if we deliberately selected an American architect and the answer's no, we didn't deliberately select an American architect, but Meier was the one who was willing to make the most reassuring commitment that we needed to move the project along.

SMITH: Did you deliberately avoid a postmodernist or a deconstructionist architect?

I mean, for example, someone like [Robert] Venturi, who has also done a lot.

WILLIAMS: No, they were all invited and Venturi was one of the seven semi-finalists. He was totally unimpressive in the interview. He behaved like a tired old man. There were a few others: Henry Cobb, Jr., at I. M. Pei's office, [Romaldo]



Giurgola, in New York, and Mark Mack, from Batey and Mack, a small firm in San Francisco, sort of a wild card. The others were ruled out. They just didn't come through quite as well.

I think Cobb could have done a nice job for us, but I was worried because it was clear from looking at some of his projects, and Venturi's, that the detail of the work and the quality of the design were not carried out in the construction phase. What became apparent was that in some of these firms, the design architect did the design, and then it was passed off to the back room, where a lot of others did the working drawings and followed through on the construction. So you lost some of the beauty of the design in the implementation. With Meier, to the contrary, when I visited the Frankfurt museum, which was under construction, there was a locked room in the basement—everybody had keys—that contained physical samples of everything that was to go into the project, from aluminum panels to doorknobs, you name it. So that there was a standard that any delivery could be matched up against. And that impressed me.

Now, there's a downside to that, too, because you never get rid of your architect. As I said to my staff early on, "Meier is an artist, his art form is architecture, and he has all the characteristics and all the problems one encounters with an artist." All the temperamental problems, always trying to improve his product, always engaged more with the art than with the cost and the other

1. The first part of the paper discusses the importance of maintaining accurate records of all transactions. This is essential for the proper management of the company's finances and for ensuring that all transactions are properly documented.

2. The second part of the paper discusses the importance of maintaining accurate records of all transactions. This is essential for the proper management of the company's finances and for ensuring that all transactions are properly documented.

3. The third part of the paper discusses the importance of maintaining accurate records of all transactions. This is essential for the proper management of the company's finances and for ensuring that all transactions are properly documented.

4. The fourth part of the paper discusses the importance of maintaining accurate records of all transactions. This is essential for the proper management of the company's finances and for ensuring that all transactions are properly documented.

5. The fifth part of the paper discusses the importance of maintaining accurate records of all transactions. This is essential for the proper management of the company's finances and for ensuring that all transactions are properly documented.

dimensions of it. But that's who we bought.

SMITH: To what degree did you factor in time and cost overruns?

WILLIAMS: The project turned out to be something totally different from what we started with. We tried to put some numbers on it. There was almost no way we could, early on. It obviously ended up costing a lot more than we ever expected it would. Fortunately, we had the resources to do it. I said to the trustees, "We're at the point of no return. If we go the next step, we're stuck, and I can't tell you precisely where it's going to end up" But even though, as I say, it was an enormous amount of money, I think the result justifies it.

SMITH: Actually, it's quite calming to be up here.

WILLIAMS: Yes, I think it's a very tranquil place, it really is, and the employees feel that way. The staff love being up here. More important, I think the visitor will feel that way, and I think that again is part of the engagement with what's here, the ability to appreciate it and enjoy it and get something out of it.

SMITH: Did you consider somebody like [Frank] Gehry or Peter Eisenman?

WILLIAMS: No, neither one was invited.

SMITH: Was that because their statements are too flamboyant?

WILLIAMS: Because their offices were too small, and their statements were a little too flamboyant. We wanted something that would be an architectural statement unto itself, a work of art unto itself, but timeless. And that ruled them both out. Not that



they aren't fine architects.

SMITH: You obviously had to make a fair number of modifications in order to placate neighbors and city and county officials—I suppose primarily city officials.

WILLIAMS: Oh, yes, it was the city. The county wasn't involved.

SMITH: Were any of those unexpected, or cause you to have to rethink an aspect of the program up here in a significant way?

WILLIAMS: Even before we selected the architect, we had to see whether we'd be able to build something up here. So we went through the conditional use process even before Richard came on board. With the benefit of hindsight, I'm glad we did. I'm sorry and glad. On the downside, we agreed to some restrictions that had a significant influence on the design. Which I don't think was bad, and I don't think we could have avoided them in any event, and Richard would have been much more difficult to work with through that process; because he has an arrogance about him, and an ungiving attitude that is very difficult to work with.

There are 107 restrictions on our use permit, more than any other use permit ever granted by the city of Los Angeles. Essentially, they were all a result of the neighbors. Marvin Braude, our councilman, insisted that our parking be underground at the bottom of the hill, so as not to obstruct the view of the hillside from the freeway, which is a bunch of bull. But we couldn't fight it, so we got an underground parking structure. The neighbors were concerned, and some of their concern was



legitimate. These are multi-million dollar homes, and Californians live outdoors.

Here was something going up on the hill above them. How would it interfere with their enjoyment of their own home? Developers are known to make promises and not keep them. But we're not developers, we don't just build something, sell it off, and go away. Some of the concerns were paranoid: "We're going to have people throwing beer cans into our back yard," and things like that.

So we had a number of restrictions, such as height limits. It would have been nice to have some kind of symbolic tower up here, but we can't, because of the height limit. There were sight line limitations, so that it never looks higher than the views as seen by the neighbors. One restriction which I liked: the neighbors didn't want white panels either. I knew even though we had a promise from Richard, we'd still have a fight about them, because, how white is white? We ended up with something that was more off-white than Richard wanted. We ended up literally with a panel—the homeowner's association has a copy, and we have one—of the approved color. It can be darker than that but not lighter. It carries my signature, Richard's signature, and the signature of the head of the homeowners' association. So it all could be compared. It was a restriction that Richard chafed under, but that was one that I was glad we had. There are restrictions on how many nights we can stay open, how late. They're concerned about wild parties up here, things like that.

SMITH: Concerts and so forth.



WILLIAMS: Yes, noise.

SMITH: Are you planning on having outdoor concerts?

WILLIAMS: Oh, yes.

SMITH: What about planning for possible future expansion? There is the question of capacity and where you might be going in terms of growth for the museum, the library, and the scholars program. It seems that your various institutes have had a tendency to keep multiplying, so do you have enough office space?

WILLIAMS: If you ask them, the answer is no, if you ask me, the answer is yes. The institutes have grown, in some instances at least, beyond what we anticipated when we did the design. I think they are large enough, and I think their resources are adequate. My own philosophy is, if you want to do something other than what you are doing, you must stop doing something you are doing. In other words, assess your priorities: how can you make the largest contribution to the field? You can't just keep growing. I don't see that as a negative. To answer your bottom line, there is no room for expansion here.

As far as the museum is concerned, there isn't a museum in the world that has all its material on view. We have a larger percentage on view than any other major museum in the world. We have plenty of storage capacity in the basement, we can rotate things. If there's a need for additional museum space, my own preference has been, from the very beginning, to build it someplace else, or lend it someplace else. I



think there's such a thing as too big a museum, in terms of the visitor's experience and so forth. My own bias is at work, obviously.

As for the research institute, we have the capacity for 1.3 million volumes. We only have 750,000. They have plenty of room to grow. We have room for something like 180 scholars at any point in time. That includes considering our own curators and all the scholars as well. So we have plenty of room for scholars, and plenty of room for the library to expand.

SMITH: So you don't rule out the possibility that there may be a third campus in the future?

WILLIAMS: Somewhere in the future. Actually, the plans for the villa make it more of a second campus than it is now. So we will have a second campus, not just a museum. So you're right, I'd like to characterize it as looking for a third campus maybe sometime in the future. Probably beyond lives in being.

SMITH: As you were thinking about this and studying and looking at museums and research institutes, were there things that you saw that you particularly liked or particularly disliked that then got reflected in one way or another, not necessarily directly, into the plan up here, and how the complex ultimately got developed?

WILLIAMS: There were a number of things. I think we all agreed, from the very beginning, that we wanted top-lit galleries for paintings, daylight, and we looked into how to accommodate that. We looked at a number of places, and the Dulwich



[Mausoleum and Picture Gallery], in London, which I think was built by Sir John Soane, if I remember correctly, was the model that we ended up with. It was simple, with just wonderful light—the way the ceilings coved and the way the light came in. We looked at some libraries. We were at the [Herzog August Bibliothek] in Wolfenbüttel, Germany. There's a wonderful reading room; you know those old-fashioned reading rooms with a high dome. There's a symbolism to that kind of reading room; we had a lot of discussion about that and whether that was what we wanted. And out of that discussion we decided no, it wasn't today's reading room; it wasn't the environment that we wanted to create.

We saw lots of gardens, particularly in Italy, and decided we wanted water as part of the garden treatment, but we were then concerned because water's a scarce commodity in Los Angeles, and we didn't want to appear to be oblivious to that problem. So we decided we were still going to have water, but it had to be the kind of water treatment that wouldn't be viewed as excessive.

SMITH: Even though, presumably, the water would be recirculating?

WILLIAMS: It recirculates, but still a lot of it evaporates. People don't stop to think that it recirculates, and you can't keep reminding them that it recirculates. I remember when I was in the government, I decided I would personally pay the difference between first-class and coach on my air travel back and forth to Los Angeles to visit the family. I got on a flight very early, sat down in first-class, and who came walking



by to sit in economy class but Senator Alan Cranston. Of course I knew Alan well enough that I could talk to him, and then it occurred to me, and I thought, "No way I'm going to be able to tell everybody that I paid the difference." So after that I sat in economy. The same thing's true of the water treatment here: rather than try to explain, just be conservative. Another thing we pushed for early on, was our own water tank, our own emergency water supply and generating system in case of fire. Because back through the years there have been some rather massive brush fires that have come through the area. Of course, the landscaping would minimize the likelihood of that, but we needed to be independent.

SMITH: You did have a near disaster at Malibu two years ago, it seems to me.

WILLIAMS: That's right.

SMITH: Or maybe three.

WILLIAMS: A couple of years ago, yes.

SMITH: Have you done anything at Malibu, or are you planning to do something out there to reduce the fire hazard?

WILLIAMS: We'll look at that in the context of the reconstruction above it, but there's nothing at this point of any major consequence, no.

SMITH: Okay. To go back to the Getty programs. We have discussed the education institute somewhat, in terms of Lani Lattin Duke's interest. Rather early on, she peeled off from your initial core group and developed this program. Your

1. The first part of the paper discusses the importance of the

second part of the paper discusses the importance of the

third part of the paper discusses the importance of the

fourth part of the paper discusses the importance of the

fifth part of the paper discusses the importance of the

sixth part of the paper discusses the importance of the

seventh part of the paper discusses the importance of the

eighth part of the paper discusses the importance of the

ninth part of the paper discusses the importance of the

tenth part of the paper discusses the importance of the

eleventh part of the paper discusses the importance of the

twelfth part of the paper discusses the importance of the

thirteenth part of the paper discusses the importance of the

fourteenth part of the paper discusses the importance of the

fifteenth part of the paper discusses the importance of the

sixteenth part of the paper discusses the importance of the

seventeenth part of the paper discusses the importance of the

eighteenth part of the paper discusses the importance of the

nineteenth part of the paper discusses the importance of the

twentieth part of the paper discusses the importance of the

pilot project was at an elementary school in Encino.

WILLIAMS: Yes. It wasn't the only pilot project, but that was one of the early schools involved.

SMITH: Was it difficult to convince the Los Angeles Unified School District, or other school districts, to get involved?

WILLIAMS: When we started, we knew it was a research and development project, and we set out certain design parameters for ourselves; it would be a summer program, I think it was supposed to go about four weeks. We solicited all the school districts in Los Angeles County and asked if they'd like to participate, and we set out certain parameters in terms of the number of teachers required. We wanted, as I recall, at least one principal, at least one person from the administrative side of the school district. We were looking for a school district commitment, not a school house commitment. We wanted a certain number of personnel at the meeting, and we wanted a commitment from the school district to implement it throughout the district, over time.

I think in the first couple of years we had twenty-one school districts involved. The last one to come in was the Los Angeles Unified School District. Of course the LA school district is broken up into regions, and it was region E, or something like that, that was part of the valley, that agreed to come in. Every one of the school districts other than LA gave their teachers stipends to come. LA felt they didn't have



the money. In fact, with LA it reached the point where I contacted the superintendent and said, "Hey, I just want you to know you're going to end up being embarrassed. All these school districts are coming in, this is going to get visibility, and LAUSD is going to be visible in its absence." So we got region E in. I don't remember the full history, but when Encino came in they were doing quite well, then it seems to me something happened and it sort of fell apart.

SMITH: That didn't get reported.

WILLIAMS: Maybe it didn't, and maybe I'm mis-recalling. One of the problems we've had generally is that there's so much turnover in teachers and principals that the program never quite gets established districtwide the way it should, because the new people coming in don't have the background or the experience with it.

SMITH: But you've felt personally enough committed to this project to keep it going, in spite of all these problems?

WILLIAMS: Oh, very much so. In some ways it could be the most important thing we're doing, because, to me, we don't have a civilized society without it. Art is a lot more than therapy. I don't know whether we've covered this before or not, but the perspective on art in the schools by and large, and on the part of school board members and maybe even a lot of parents, has been that art is something therapeutic; it's something you do as a release, or on a rainy day instead of recess. But it's really part of the education of the civilized person. Art and design are around us all the

[The text on this page is extremely faint and illegible. It appears to be a list or index of items, possibly names of people or places, arranged in several columns. Some words are difficult to discern but may include terms like "John", "Mary", "James", "Elizabeth", "Thomas", "Richard", "Henry", "William", "George", "Edward", "Charles", "John", "Mary", "James", "Elizabeth", "Thomas", "Richard", "Henry", "William", "George", "Edward", "Charles".]

time, telling us about mankind and the history of the world, and a lot of other things.

So our commitment is deep seated, and we're now at a point where most of the state frameworks require our version of art education: something like forty-five of the fifty states.

SMITH: Is this because of your efforts?

WILLIAMS: In part because of our effort. We're now part of Goals 2000, which is, I'd say, in large part due to our effort. The voluntary national standards in the arts reflect our beliefs. We're not alone, we adopted a view that was out there, but it was a very minority view, one that was not widespread. And of course we're bucking uphill against the business world's emphasis on competitiveness, which to them means science and math, and the squeeze on school budgets. Art has obviously not been a priority; in fact, it's pretty low down on the list.

SMITH: Though, apparently, students have been getting the message that corporations are preferring to hire, say, English or history majors rather than people who've majored in business or engineering, which has been a change in the last several years, so corporations themselves seem to be thinking through the question of flexible thinking.

WILLIAMS: That's true. But still, when you read the articles, "Are we competitive?" what are they comparing? They're comparing math and science. So it's still an uphill battle.

[The text on this page is extremely faint and illegible. It appears to be a list or a series of entries, possibly organized in a table with multiple columns. The content is too blurry to transcribe accurately.]

SMITH: In your own thinking about this, does this connect with some conception of creative process and design as a form of inherent intellectual process?

WILLIAMS: Oh, very much so. And what we're finding is that kids in our program not only develop a better understanding of art, but it rubs off on vocabulary, it seems to influence their math skills; it seems to have a much broader influence. Now, we don't have enough quality research in those areas, but there's a lot of anecdotal material that suggests that that's the case. To me it's not a coincidence that many if not most of the Nobel laureate scientists are good artists in one art form or another. Some of them even talked about it. [Richard] Feynman talked about the role of art, how art enabled him to express himself in different ways, and how important it was. I think there's a lot to the left-brain business, and this really helps develop it.

SMITH: So this is something that you hope the Getty Center will continue investing in?

WILLIAMS: I do, and I've spoken a lot on it. It was my talk to the President's Committee three or four years ago that got this thing going into Goals 2000. It probably is what got me on the President's Committee. I believe in it deeply. I would say that it's very consistent with my interests in education, generally, and with all the activities that the Getty's involved with and I've been involved with. The whole area of art education is most likely to carry on for me, whether in relation to the Getty or otherwise.



SMITH: The Getty Grant Program was something that you introduced in '83, and I understand that this did cause some concern from the trustees, partly because there had been a policy that the Getty did not make grants prior, so this represented a major change in policy and maybe required a rereading of Getty's will?

WILLIAMS: No, not really. It was a turn-about in the sense that, as I've indicated earlier, there was a lot of confusion when I came to the Getty, in some people's minds, that Getty was going to be a major grant maker. We've finally gotten out of that confusion, and we're kind of reintroducing it, in a way.

[Tape VII, Side Two]

WILLIAMS: In a way, for the buck, we probably are getting more of a bang out of the grant program than we are from any other activity at the Getty. We've made over fifteen hundred grants now in something like over a hundred countries. It's quite a program, and it's made a difference in a lot of areas.

SMITH: How did you locate Deborah Marrow as the person who ought to head it up, and what kind of qualities were you looking for?

WILLIAMS: Well, the original director of the grant program was Nancy. Deborah had already lived in LA. She had worked at one time at the Norton Simon. I think she was doing some teaching in the area. I don't remember how she came to our attention. We interviewed her at one point and didn't have anything for her, and then when we started the grant program and Nancy needed some help, we remembered



Deborah, and she was interested in coming to work for us. She was somebody who had knowledge of the field and who was not an ideologue. I must say, I didn't have any idea of how good she was when we hired her; she seemed okay for the role that we were hiring her for. It was a situation where if she hadn't worked out, she was local anyway. But Nancy thought she was capable, and I had that impression as well. And she's been terrific. She's level headed, she's open-minded, and she's well disciplined.

I'd say one of the great strengths and criticisms of the program is it is a very disciplined program. It deals heavily with peer review. People who don't understand it tend to suggest it may be bureaucratic, but it isn't. The standards that are set by that program are now being emulated by others. When we endorse something by a grant it carries some real significance. In fact, there was a recent article in *Art Newspaper* on one of our architectural conservation grants, to the Vatican. We are active shapers of the grants. A grant will come in, and we don't just say yes or no. We often will say, "Yes, if . . ." We might require certain things to happen, or changes to be made to the proposal. The article said that as a result of our requirements, the Vatican project had been better developed and ultimately cost less to complete. The Vatican came back and said publicly, in the press, that our changes in their proposal really resulted in a better project at a lower cost. That's an unusual statement by anyone, and certainly not the kind that the Vatican is necessarily given



to. But it's illustrative more broadly of the philosophy of our grant program.

SMITH: Have there been areas of investigation that you've personally introduced into the grant program?

WILLIAMS: Actually, I think Deborah, Jack [Meyers], and Tim [Whalen] have been very good at conceptualization, continuously reviewing and challenging programs to see whether we're getting the most out of our categories, whether they're the right categories, and how to construct and redefine them. But, particularly in the last year, with the prospective opening of the Getty Center, I have been urging that we look more closely at what we could do for Los Angeles.

There's one program that they haven't disagreed with at all, but it's been very slow to get going, and I've gotten impatient with it. While we're not going to get into a lot of grants for local organizations, there are a lot of smaller and medium-sized ones in the LA area, as there are throughout the country, that ought to be reassessing their future, given what's happening to funding for the arts. They need some help in thinking about who they are and what they want to become. What we've now started is a grant category for grants to provide resources for institutions to do just that. The Santa Monica Museum of Art is one that we have funded and I think there are two or three others. Without getting beyond our other specific categories and without getting into any operating funding, which I don't want us to do and which we shouldn't do, I think we can help organizations in this area to a better future. We can



help them to conclude that they ought to merge, or, in some cases perhaps, that they ought to go out of business, or whatever.

SMITH: In terms of your relationship with the institute directors, you have your own opinions about things, but is your philosophy to let them develop what they want to develop, and then your job is to probe and provide a series of questions, or do you view the programs as ways of implementing your own personal objectives?

WILLIAMS: No, it's the former. I may have suggestions for them, in terms of things I'd like them to consider. There are areas that I spot that look interesting, or insights that come to me from wherever. I do challenge what they want to do. But it's rare for me to say, "No, you can't do it," or for me to tell them, "Go do so-and-so." It just doesn't happen very often. I'm a voracious reader and they get a lot of stuff from me; I'm their clipping service, in a way. Often I add a comment or two, because it may provide a different perspective, or it may indicate someone else who's doing something in areas related to what we're doing or thinking about. I try to stimulate their thinking and keep them loose, in a way, and challenged, but basically it's their ball game. After a few years here, I remember saying, "When I first came here, I was having all the fun. Now it's the program directors who are having all the fun." A bit of an overstatement, but there's a lot to it.

SMITH: Basically, you want disciplined dreamers, but what steps have you taken to avoid the dangers of bureaucratization, the kind of arteriosclerosis that happens in

1. The first part of the paper discusses the importance of understanding the underlying mechanisms of the observed phenomena. This section highlights the need for a comprehensive theoretical framework that can account for the complex interactions between the various factors involved. The authors argue that a purely descriptive approach is insufficient and that a more mechanistic understanding is required to make meaningful predictions and to develop effective interventions.

2. In the second part, the authors present a detailed analysis of the data collected from the experimental studies. They show that the results are consistent with the theoretical predictions, but also reveal some unexpected findings that warrant further investigation. The authors discuss the implications of these findings for the broader field and suggest directions for future research.

3. The third part of the paper focuses on the practical applications of the research findings. The authors discuss how the results can be used to inform policy decisions and to develop new interventions. They emphasize the importance of considering the context in which the interventions are implemented and the need for ongoing evaluation and refinement.

4. Finally, the authors conclude by summarizing the key points of the paper and reiterating the importance of the research. They express their hope that the findings will contribute to a better understanding of the phenomena under study and that they will be useful to other researchers in the field.

every organization?

WILLIAMS: That's probably the biggest danger we face. Not just bureaucratization, but a sense of being self-satisfied: "Gee, aren't we great." That concerns me a lot, because if that happens, we've failed. I try to deal with that partly through visiting committees, partly through my own challenging, partly through turnover and ventilation, not only at the top level, but the next levels down, just continuously harping on that subject. But it does worry me, and it worries me in the selection of my successor. It's also a plus to have a successor, because whoever succeeds me is going to have his or her own view of the world and his or her own approach, and hopefully that'll be positive.

SMITH: How did the Getty Leadership Institute develop as an initiative? Whose idea was it?

WILLIAMS: I don't remember how that came in. It existed before us, but it was just barely surviving. I'm pretty sure it was Lani who brought it in. If it was going to survive, it needed a sponsor, and I've got a background in management education; in fact, the management of the arts program at UCLA developed under my tenure there. It's something the field needed, so we adopted it rather than having it fail or putter along. It's a much different program than it was then; it's much stronger. The content is much stronger, the quality of teaching is much stronger, and it's under continuous review; it has its own visiting committee, and we are continually reviewing the

1. The first part of the document is a letter from the President of the United States to the Congress, dated January 1, 1801. It contains a statement of the President's views on the state of the Union and the progress of the government.

2. The second part of the document is a report from the Secretary of the Treasury, dated January 1, 1801. It contains a statement of the financial condition of the United States and the progress of the government.

3. The third part of the document is a report from the Secretary of the Navy, dated January 1, 1801. It contains a statement of the naval condition of the United States and the progress of the government.

4. The fourth part of the document is a report from the Secretary of the War, dated January 1, 1801. It contains a statement of the military condition of the United States and the progress of the government.

5. The fifth part of the document is a report from the Secretary of the Interior, dated January 1, 1801. It contains a statement of the internal condition of the United States and the progress of the government.

6. The sixth part of the document is a report from the Secretary of the State, dated January 1, 1801. It contains a statement of the foreign condition of the United States and the progress of the government.

7. The seventh part of the document is a report from the Secretary of the War, dated January 1, 1801. It contains a statement of the military condition of the United States and the progress of the government.

8. The eighth part of the document is a report from the Secretary of the Navy, dated January 1, 1801. It contains a statement of the naval condition of the United States and the progress of the government.

9. The ninth part of the document is a report from the Secretary of the Treasury, dated January 1, 1801. It contains a statement of the financial condition of the United States and the progress of the government.

10. The tenth part of the document is a report from the Secretary of the State, dated January 1, 1801. It contains a statement of the foreign condition of the United States and the progress of the government.

curriculum and the quality of the instruction.

I think it makes a contribution, because it's not limited to art museums. In the museum world, almost invariably the tendency has been that the person appointed director has come up the curatorial route and is then thrown into running the institution, without any training in the fundamentals of how you manage people, how you read a financial statement, how you raise money, or how you relate to the board of trustees and so forth. We've tried to give them a crash course.

SMITH: Your perception of the interrelationship of cultural institutions and public policy does seem to me to be somewhat unique. It's not that other people didn't have equally strong interests in both areas—I'm thinking of Franklin Murphy or Richard Sherwood—but they seem to actually remain distinct, so that the cultural aspect was an amassing of the monuments, making them available, but not something that had quite the interventionary aspect that the Getty has developed. Why do you think that you have a more integrated sense of the relationship of culture and its possibilities for affecting public policy?

WILLIAMS: I don't know. I'd say, in fairness, it just grew. It was not part of the vision for the Getty that we would get involved in public policy; it's just something we kind of grew into. I suspect if we'd set it out as part of the mission we wouldn't have been able to achieve it. Just as the museums initially weren't interested in having us lead the way in developing an information base, no one was looking for the Getty to



come in and get involved in public policy. You might say it's something we earned our way into, or were invited into, or we filled a void. I don't know quite how to describe it.

Apart from that, sensing the opportunity is something that may be peculiar to me. One of my other activities is my membership in something called the Public Policy Institute of California, which is a nonprofit organization. When you look at what I've done, whether it was at the university or in the government, it's always had some policy implications or policy objectives in it. So I tend to think that way. I can smell the opportunities.

SMITH: I did want to ask you something about the Securities and Exchange Commission. We've generally not really treated it, but historians now look at the Carter period as the beginning of conscious restructuring of the economy, and there was the period when deregulation really begins. When you were chair of the SEC, did you have as a conscious motivation a program of restructuring the economy from an industrial to what used to be called a postindustrial economy, or were you primarily reacting to policy initiatives that came from either the White House or Congress?

WILLIAMS: No, we were not reactive at all. It was not part of the SEC's mandate to impact the economy. We took some deregulatory initiatives in different ways, and basically I think it's fair to say they were all my own doing. Some are only now



beginning to bear fruit, which is fascinating. When William O. Douglas resigned as chairman of the SEC in the 1930s, before he went to the Supreme Court, he said, "There's one thing I haven't accomplished, and that's the integration of the provisions of the '33 and the '34 acts." I won't go into detail on what those were, but the fact that they were not integrated caused a lot of extra work, extra confusion, and a lot of cost and bureaucracy. Well, under my stewardship, the commission integrated them, forty-five years later.

I was very active in pleading with the Investment Company Institute, which is a sort of trade association of the mutual fund industry. I said, "Look, over time, you've got to play a stronger self-regulatory role, or the government's going to play it. I'd be willing to see the SEC play less of a role than it plays even now if you'll take on a greater responsibility," which they refused to do. I used the bully pulpit repeatedly, banging away at corporate directorships and the responsibility of directors of American corporations, saying that unless they changed, we were going to end up with more rules and more laws. That had some effect. It wasn't a matter of lessening the laws, but I wanted the corporate community to be more responsible than it was.

When Senator Howard Metzenbaum introduced a piece of legislation called the Shareholder Rights Bill, he included in it a number of things that I had been advocating. He invited me to testify on the bill, and I came in and testified against it. He said, "Harold, I don't understand you. I'm just trying to do what you say." I said,



"I've said the corporate community ought to do it on its own. You're advocating the very thing that I don't want to have happen." The same thing was true of the accounting profession. In fact, I kept pounding on them to strengthen their own self-regulation, which they did.

I introduced a requirement that in the proxy material consulting fees paid to outside auditors should be disclosed annually to the shareholders. It gets too complicated, but obviously the auditors are there to audit and to testify to the integrity of financial statements of the company. In order to do so, they've got to be independent. But at the same time, these auditing firms offer consulting services, and in some instances those consulting services were getting to be pretty big, and I began to worry whether that would affect their independence, that they had too much business of other kinds to be truly independent. So I introduced a requirement that these consulting fees be disclosed, but when I left, my successor cut that out.

SMITH: I did notice in one periodical that you identified the potential for the savings and loan debacle that occurred.

WILLIAMS: Yes. Conversely, I used to argue at length with Fred Kahn, who was head of the CAA [Civil Aeronautics Authority] that you can't just willy-nilly deregulate an industry that's grown up in a culture of regulation without creating some real chaos; there has to be a better way to do it than just cold turkey. Obviously, I didn't prevail.

THE [illegible] OF [illegible]
[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]
[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]
[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]
[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]
[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]
[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]
[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]
[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]
[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]
[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]
[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]
[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]
[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]
[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]
[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

SMITH: No. Did you have any voice in the Reagan administration?

WILLIAMS: Oh no. I was a philistine as far as the Reagan administration was concerned. I didn't have the right ideology.

SMITH: When you come to cultural institutions, with the kind of activist, or protean vision that you have, you have to deal with the sorts of people who are attracted to art history and museum work, and maybe one of the things that attracts them to the very field is the ivory tower, and you can't change that with the wave of a wand, I would think. Is there a way of working with people, educating them, and creating a condition where they are less ivory tower-ish? Is there a way of creating a structure that redirects behavior?

WILLIAMS: I don't know. I doubt it. But I think people to whom the shelter of the academic community is vital are not the kind of people who are going to come to the Getty. So there's a self-selection process in that sense. But within the academic community, I don't know how to do it. I think what one can do, and what I tried to do at [UCLA] was to find those that were interested and capable and move them into positions of influence or leadership. The buy-in varies. Sometimes you find there's a lot more buy-in than you anticipated. There is a lot of openness on the part of academics to explore new approaches or new areas so long as they don't feel threatened by it.

SMITH: In talking to people over a number of years about the history of the Getty or



their impressions of it, there is a sense that you and Nancy in particular, but also Lani Lattin Duke, were a group apart from everybody else. This was not said necessarily negatively, but just as a matter of fact; that the vision for the whole operation came out of that particular interaction.

WILLIAMS: I think it's true, yes. I think I may have said this on another occasion, but I think the loss of Nancy to the Getty is one the Getty's paid a high price for.

SMITH: Actually, you haven't said it. Maybe elsewhere, but not here.

WILLIAMS: I think the Getty paid a price. I recognize the complications if she had stayed, but it was a real loss to the Getty.

SMITH: It also sounds like, given Lani Lattin Duke's focus on the education area, the protean aspects of the Getty really developed in an intellectual relationship between you and Nancy.

WILLIAMS: No question.

SMITH: And that then became a personal relationship.

WILLIAMS: Exactly.

SMITH: Which alarmed some people and complicated things. Could you talk a little bit about the nature of that exchange that you and Nancy had intellectually, what made it work so well, and your perceptions of the way other people at the Getty responded to the developing personal relationship that the two of you had?

WILLIAMS: I don't really know how to characterize it. A lot of it was just a give



and take between us. We just had an ability to kind of dream together and spark each other. I talked earlier about people developing beyond what they visualize their capability to be. I think that was true of Nancy. She really blossomed, and as we began to create these institutions, in many respects I just gave her a lot more headway. We talked a lot, but she went off and she was doing a lot of the creative work. She's the kind of person who could take a problem and figure out how to address it in very creative and very effective ways. If she needed to reach certain people, she would find out who she should be talking to, who she should be asking questions of, who could contribute.

There were times when our intellectual partnership ran into problems, where Nancy was going down a track I was questioning, and at times we reached a point where she got angry at me for questioning where she was going. I think it's fair to say that I don't know how and when the personal situation that evolved between Nancy and me started, or when others became aware of it and what effect it had. It did reach a point where I told the trustees about it, and some of them got a little upset.

In a way, it's been typical throughout my career, and I don't know why, that I have a degree of remoteness, and there were people at the Getty, including directors of programs, who found it easier to talk to Nancy about something that was bothering them than to talk to me. It reached a point where the directors themselves got together and had their own meeting and told the trustees that they were not



concerned about Nancy and my relationship having an adverse impact. But it was getting uncomfortable enough that Nancy and I finally decided we had to do something about it. She wanted both of us to leave.

SMITH: Oh, together?

WILLIAMS: Yes, and I elected not to do that; I felt I couldn't. Nancy's carried a certain bitterness about the Getty ever since, so that we don't have the ongoing kind of ability to talk about things at the Getty in the way I'd like.

SMITH: She did indicate that in fact she prefers not to know what's happening at the Getty.

WILLIAMS: Which is really strange, and really too bad.

SMITH: After she resigned from the Getty, was there anybody who could take up the role that she had played vis-à-vis your thinking?

WILLIAMS: No, not at that time, unfortunately. In fact, you know, wherever I've been, up until the time Nancy left, I've always had someone for whom the primary role was to be the one who challenges what we're doing, a sort of internal counterculture. Nancy played that role very well. But when she left, I felt the organization was too fragile for me to bring another person in who didn't have the background and who couldn't play that role initially, and I lived without it. I kind of have it now, with both Steve Rountree and Gwen Walden, and to an extent with Marianne Rusk and Deborah Marrow. But I missed it for quite a while, I didn't have



it—someone I could just kick anything around with.

SMITH: Did that increase your turning to outside peers like Franklin or Norton to discuss things?

WILLIAMS: No, no, I just had to do it myself.

SMITH: The Getty's had a number of persistent critics or snipers, and Thomas Hoving would be, in some ways, ironically, the most prominent of them. Are there critics who have been helpful to you in some way? Maybe that wasn't their intention, but by persistently lobbing grenades in the direction of the Getty, have they helped you think through some problems?

WILLIAMS: Critics are very valuable. They can cause you to take a hard look at what you are doing. There's a tendency to ignore critics, but I don't think we've ignored them. Hoving is a separate case. Hoving is a haranguer with an ax to grind and no necessary respect for the truth. It's harder to entertain criticism from somebody like Hoving, because it isn't well motivated. So you intend to ignore somebody like that. But there have been other critics. I don't remember the name, but somebody had written an article about the research institute and about the Getty.

SMITH: Oh, the article that was in the *Los Angeles Times*?

WILLIAMS: No. That was one, though. I hadn't thought of that, but there was one that was written by an academic in one of the academic journals. I take those seriously. You know, we talk about them internally, and I won't let us brush those



things off. Now, we may conclude that we're right, or they don't understand, or whatever, but it's not a brush-off. I think criticisms are very valuable.

SMITH: In the half-hour that we have left, the first thing I wanted to raise was the response that you had personally, and the Getty's response, to the collapse of the Soviet Union and the Soviet bloc. It seems that you did then initiate a number of programs in Eastern Europe to integrate scholarly and cultural life on both sides of the former Iron Curtain. What did you see as the Getty's potential role in helping to shape a post-cold war world?

WILLIAMS: Well, to a degree, I was inadvertently sensitized to the situation because of two events: Stephanie Barron at the Los Angeles County Museum of Art had an exhibition that was opening in East Germany, and this was while the wall was still up. I hadn't been to East Germany since about 1973, and I decided that for a number of reasons it was an appropriate time to go. I traveled throughout East Germany to get exposure to the museums, to libraries, and to the political, cultural, and economic conditions there.

Some time not too much later than that, I was invited by Chancellor [Helmut] Kohl to be part of a group of American foundations that came together in Bonn. Kohl was of a mind that said that the relationship between the United States and West Germany was in the process of change, because a lot of the institutions and reactions that had been a part of the post-World War II climate were behind us and the two



nations were drifting apart. He felt that there was a role for the American foundations and a perspective that the American foundations could bring to bear that would be useful in sustaining the relationship.

It was an interesting meeting. At dinner I had an opportunity to sit across from Chancellor Kohl; there were six of us at the table. I remember the rumblings about the wall, and I asked Kohl whether he thought the wall would come down and what the consequences would be, and he said he wasn't sure when, but there was no doubt the wall was going to come down and a reunification of Germany would occur. While I was there I went back into East Germany and visited the museums in East Berlin again.

And then the wall came down. I made another trip and visited Warsaw, Budapest, Prague, and East Berlin. I saw directors of museums, research centers, and conservation institutes. I was amazed to see just how cut off they'd been. The art historians, to the extent that there were any, were doing research almost exclusively on local art. They were totally out of touch with what had been going on, certainly post-World War II. Libraries virtually didn't exist post-World War II. Conservation techniques were in a similar state. It just seemed that something ought to happen, so some of our people in the grant program went over and I think some others did as well. We realized we were not going to be able to turn these institutions around.

I remember sitting in Kraków, with the art history faculty at Jagiellonian



University, talking about what might be useful in the way of helping them build their library, or other things, and I wasn't getting much of a response. It reached a point where I said to them, "I don't get any enthusiasm for what I'm talking about." And one of them said, "Mr. Williams, we don't even have a slide projector that works." You know, plain ordinary things; they didn't have the basic, simplest kinds of paints or chemicals that one uses in conservation.

So we realized we weren't going to be able to deal with all that, particularly, but we asked ourselves what we *should* do. It was the grant program that came up with two of the suggestions that we followed very aggressively: one was to provide opportunities for young scholars to travel to the west and to be exposed to other scholars and institutions and libraries, and the second suggestion was to offer library grants in the major cities of three countries, Czechoslovakia, Poland, and Hungary, if the museums and universities would form a coalition and agree on how the money was to be spent to augment the libraries—we wanted them to become a central resource. Also, the research institute and the museum went through their duplicate books and journals, looked at what they had that was beyond their needs, and sent those over. I think those were the main things we did.

Then some other things began to develop. The conservation institute went over there and we had some conservators come over here. We've undertaken a couple of conservation projects, including the restoration of the mosaics at St. Vitus

1. The first part of the document discusses the importance of maintaining accurate records of all transactions and activities. It emphasizes the need for transparency and accountability in financial reporting.

2. The second part of the document outlines the various methods and techniques used to collect and analyze data. It includes a detailed description of the experimental procedures and the statistical analysis performed.

3. The third part of the document presents the results of the study. It includes a series of tables and graphs that illustrate the findings of the research. The data shows a clear trend of increasing activity over time.

4. The fourth part of the document discusses the implications of the findings. It suggests that the results have significant implications for the field of research and may lead to further developments in the future.

5. The fifth part of the document concludes the study. It summarizes the main findings and provides a final statement on the importance of the research.

Cathedral in Prague and a project in St. Petersburg, which began after the fire at the library there, when the Library of Congress and the Getty pulled together a conference on paper conservation and problems related to the fire. We brought together conservators throughout Russia, most of whom had never met each other. Now we're working with the Academy of Sciences there, on conservation. We've made a few grants in various places around issues of conservation.

[Tape VIII, Side One]

WILLIAMS: We're still looking at what to do with scholarship there. The scholars can't compete yet with western scholars for grants. They're not at the same level. We haven't an answer yet about what, if anything, we should be doing at this point. I think we did some things that were important; it became another grant category for us. We probably could have done much more if it had been more of a focus for us.

SMITH: You have also been involved in a relatively recent initiative to expand connections and activities in Latin America, in which I gather Tom Reese played a central role. What led you to decide that that might be something that ought to be done?

WILLIAMS: It was a combination of things: it's obvious, geographically, and in view of the demographics of this area and the growing relationship between this country and Latin America, that we should be involved. The conservation institute was doing a limited amount of work down there. In many ways it's a lot easier to



work in Latin America than it is in other parts of the world; you have less time zones to travel through, and in some ways it's just easier. Obviously, Corzo is Hispanic, Tom Reese's scholarly interests are Hispanic, Nancy was spending a lot of time down there, meeting a lot of interesting people who we could work with, so it seemed logical that we should at least explore what the opportunities and needs were.

At one point a group of us, including Tom, Miguel Angel, Deborah Marrow, and I went down and spent some time traveling around to get a better sense of what was there and what the needs might be. We haven't done as much down there as I thought might come out of that visit, and in part it's because there's not much scholarship going on down there in art history. So one has to almost start at the grass roots. We've had a few scholars up here at the research institute. The conservation institute is doing some work down there in training, although training is a less prominent activity right now in conservation than it has been. And Tom has his project down there. I think part of the problem, whether it's government or private, is that the arts and art scholarship are not very high on the agenda. Conservation isn't either.

SMITH: Not even for tourism purposes, then?

WILLIAMS: No. So it hasn't been easy to get any leverage down there. But we haven't given up on it.

SMITH: I wanted to talk to you about the '92 riots, or civil disturbances, and what



you felt the Getty's role in the Los Angeles community might be and the role that it could play in addressing the problems that the disturbances had revealed.

WILLIAMS: We haven't done much of anything in that area. I would hope that with the Getty Center we can be somewhat more proactive, but it certainly has heightened my sensitivity. I haven't done anything particularly about it either, other than talk about it. I've talked a lot around the city about the need to build community; I think we're the prototype of the metropolitan area of the twenty-first century. We're more ethnically diverse than any other city in the world, probably, but the term I've used in my talks is that we're not a community, we're a series of *ethnic enclaves*. I hope with our outreach, which will be very aggressive, to get these ethnic communities to come to the Getty and feel a sense of welcome and ownership of the place. I think we can make some small contribution towards building community.

SMITH: Part of this involves a sense of what the cultural base is, and it strikes me that the way things get sliced, you have the European cultural heritage, but then the African cultural heritage and the Latin American cultural heritage get treated as African art or Pre-Columbian art—not an ongoing cultural process which is intertwined with European art in inextricable ways. That may not necessarily be something that the Getty can address, but it's certainly a problem at LACMA.

WILLIAMS: I met just yesterday with Andrea Rich, who's the new head of LACMA, on that very issue. They've got some interesting ideas, and I expect Andrea will do



something about it, and we'll work with them on it. And we can do things too. We don't have to own collections of the other ethnic arts in order to bring them in and interrelate them in interesting ways. But I certainly don't want to have to have an exhibition of African art to get Afro-Americans in, because then they'll come for that and that's all, and all that does is further the apartness, in a sense. You know, I strongly resent and oppose Prop. 209 in California and the abolition of affirmative action at the university. But there's something to the argument that the other side makes, that we've got to get away from addressing things in terms of ethnic groups and defining things in terms of ethnicity. I don't agree that that is a justification for getting away from efforts to provide and ensure that there is equal opportunity, but I can't ignore the concern.

SMITH: How aggressive and how successful have the affirmative action programs been at the Getty?

WILLIAMS: I'd say they're reasonably aggressive. We do look broadly. We certainly have our share of women. I'd say the search invariably includes an effort, in a position of any consequence, to search out minority candidates. We haven't been overwhelmingly successful. Obviously, we've been much less successful with Afro-Americans than with any other group. I'd say within the senior management of the Getty there's essentially one black. There are a lot of Asians around, but none of them are in senior management per se. We don't count heads, but we do make a very



conscious effort.

We've had an internal program which I started, on cultural diversity, for four or five years now, trying to sensitize ourselves, in terms of our own behavior, in terms of our recruiting, in terms of what it ought to mean in relation to our outreach. I've encouraged the adoption of a school in Culver City, the Stoner Avenue School, which is entirely Hispanic and Afro-American, and we have a number of our staff who volunteer out there. To me this has two purposes: it gets us out into the community, rather than waiting for the community to come to us, and it gives us more of a direct exposure to what is the growing majority in the city. We've brought some of that back with us; it sort of comes back in. In fact, we had a ceremony last week that I participated in, we delivered a thousand books to the Stoner Avenue School that were bought by contributions from the staff. It was quite a nice ceremony, and we had enough staff there, volunteers, so they could go into all forty classrooms and read to the kids.

SMITH: I wanted to ask you about your response and your involvement in the ongoing NEA crisis, which actually goes back to at least '89, probably before then, but '89 seems to be when it first comes to a head.

WILLIAMS: Is it that long ago?

SMITH: Yes, it's that long ago. Actually, the Getty was the site of a series of Congressional hearings on the NEA in 1989.



WILLIAMS: That's right, I forgot about that. At that time we served as a forum for the hearing; we had been asked. We're in a delicate position. We cannot lobby—that's by law and at the risk of our tax exemption. Some institutions get away with some lobbying. I've insisted that we stay pure because we're too high profile. But, you know, I've been personally rather outspoken. I testified at the last go-around. When the committee called me, I said, "Look, I can't volunteer. If you want to invite me to come, then I can do so." So I got a letter of invitation and spoke out strongly on the importance of the NEA. I've also been able to speak out in my capacity as a member of the President's Committee. I've been on the phone this week with Congressman Yates's office on the current status, and I got a long report from them, which I faxed to a number of other institutions, followed by phone calls saying, "If you know any people who have influence on the Republican side, you'd better get them on the phone."

It's a disaster, it's anti-intellectual, it's anti-cultural, and it's very dangerous. I'm not free to be as outspoken about it as I'd like to be, but if being president of the Getty and visible all these years carries over at all, I expect to be more of a spokesman after I leave here.

SMITH: Do you see a way of resolving the NEA crisis?

WILLIAMS: Not really, not really. There is all kinds of talk about dedicated revenue streams, or other ways of funding the endowment, but I don't think any of



them will work. When we produced the report of the President's Committee in New York, the report titled "Creative America," there was a press conference, and the first question from the press was something to the effect of, "Is government funding important?" John Brademus, who chairs the committee, said, "I think I'll ask Mr. Williams of the committee to respond to that question." Out of the blue. I don't even remember precisely what I said, but it got on the radio all over the country. In effect, I said the arts are important to the country, and the federal government has to make a statement that they are important. If they're not important enough for the federal government to support, then why are they important enough for anyone? I put it differently and better than that; I was inspired at the moment. But the thrust of it was that we've *got* to make a statement that art and culture are on the national agenda.

SMITH: In terms of the way the arts community has responded to this, now looking back on it, what mistakes do you think were made? What do you think they should have done instead of what they did do, and how might that shape strategy, including your strategy, over the next several years, assuming there even is an NEA?

WILLIAMS: Well, frankly, I've got to think more strategically about that than I have, but I think people involved in the arts have developed their own smugness and sense of importance that has been self-destructive, to some extent, with the attitude, "Of course the arts are important." After all, the endowment does exist in a political context, and one cannot ignore that totally. In Nancy Hanks' time, I think some of the



problems that the endowment encountered wouldn't have happened, because she had a political sense that said, "In the best interests of the endowment, maybe we'd better not do a couple of these things, even though they're worth doing." There was a sense of political judgment there that said, "Look, let's not draw hostile fire."

During the hearings I participated in, when Slate Gordon said to one of the witnesses, "You know, we have oversight of the National Science Foundation, and we ask them questions and we get reports from them. Don't you think we ought to have some oversight over the arts?" the witness said, "No." Gordon just sort of looked at him, smiled, closed his file, and walked out of the room. The whole point being, we have oversight over all these billions of dollars of activities in the country in various areas, but in the arts we're supposed to not have any oversight. It's not an answer you can give a politician.

Most of the witnesses were giving away half a loaf to try to save the other half, but they were each giving away a different piece of the loaf. There was no organized strategy on the part of the field. Most of the people who were testifying were artists. Where was the public? Where were the consumers of the arts? Where were the major companies in the industry? Where were the Disneys and the MCAs, the people who commercialize the arts, who draw their talent in many ways from artists nourished in their development by grants from the NEA? They weren't there. There was no campaign, and it didn't put the arts' best foot forward. Now, as to how

1. The first part of the document discusses the importance of maintaining accurate records of all transactions and activities. It emphasizes the need for transparency and accountability in financial reporting.

2. The second part of the document outlines the various methods and techniques used to collect and analyze data. It includes a detailed description of the experimental procedures and the statistical analysis performed.

3. The third part of the document presents the results of the study. It includes a series of tables and graphs that illustrate the findings of the research. The data shows a clear trend of increasing activity over time.

4. The fourth part of the document discusses the implications of the findings. It suggests that the results have significant implications for the field of study and may lead to further research in this area.

5. The fifth part of the document concludes the study. It summarizes the main findings and provides a final statement on the importance of the research.

to do that differently and what the strategy ought to be, I haven't had the time to focus on it, but it has to be a different kind of campaign.

SMITH: Is this one of the things that you are likely to put as a priority interest after you retire next winter?

WILLIAMS: I don't know, probably. But I've committed myself to two projects that I'm involved in that will carry over, both related to education: one K-12, and the other higher education. Other than that, I've told myself I'm not going to make any plans for what I do after I leave here. I know I'm not going to retire. I'm not going to worry about being busy. I don't want to start accepting things because I don't know what my alternatives are going to be. I don't know what I'm going to feel like doing. So I'm going to go fallow and build up from there, and decide more deliberately and at leisure how I want to shape my life—how full I want it to be, and what I really want to commit to, not just get busy with.

SMITH: Will you remain active in the Getty?

WILLIAMS: That's going to be up to my successor.

SMITH: So you may or may not be on the board of trustees?

WILLIAMS: I may or may not, yes. I would say the likelihood is I won't, because I don't believe in chief executives staying on boards after they retire. I'll have an office here. That's being planned now, but it won't be in this building, it'll be over at the research institute. I'll have a title, I'll be president emeritus, but what I'll be doing, I



don't know yet.

SMITH: Are you involved in the search for your successor?

WILLIAMS: No.

SMITH: No. So you'll be retiring on January 1?

WILLIAMS: Well, I said January 5, which is my birthday, but it'll probably be the end of the month.

SMITH: Your relationship comes to rather a complete end.

WILLIAMS: It's the right time. I'll have completed what I came to do. The Getty enters a new phase, and I think it's good to have fresh leadership at that point. The Getty needed to have leadership that could commit for at least a decade, and I don't fit either criterion: I'm not fresh, and at my age, even more important, in my own sense of self, I don't want to make a ten-year commitment.

SMITH: Okay, I think that's it, unless you have something that you'd like to add in closing.

WILLIAMS: No. I assume we'll probably be having more sessions.

SMITH: Yes, I think that's likely.

WILLIAMS: But for the moment we've done quite a bit.



INDEX

- Ackerman, James, 65
 Armand Hammer Museum of Art and Cultural Center, 105-106
 Art History Information Program (AHIP). *See* Getty Information Program
Avery Index, 138
- Barron, Stephanie, 176
 Bentsen, Lloyd, 25
 Berg, Harold, 32, 43, 46, 55
 Bibliotheca Hertziana, 65-66, 126
 Boatner, Haydon, 15
 Bond, Alan, 95
 Bok, Derek, 31
 Bouts, Dieric, 101
 Brademus, John, 185
 Bramlett, Norris, 47
 Braude, Marvin, 152
 Bredekamp, Horst, 125
- Carr, Charles H., 13, 20
 Carter, Jimmy, 25-26
 Chastel, André, 64, 65
 Christopher, Warren, 12
 Clark, Wilbur, 17-18
 Cobb, Henry, Jr., 149, 150
 Cory, Ken, 24
 Corzo, Miguel Angel, 134-135, 180
 Cousins, Norman, 30
 Cranston, Alan, 24, 28, 157
- Daley, Richard, 24
 de-accessioning, 113-114
 Doerner Institute, 68, 69, 70
 Doherty, Francis X., 12
 Douglas, William O., 169
- Duke, Leilani Lattin, 37, 38-40, 42, 61-62, 63, 83, 84, 157, 166, 172
 Dulwich Mausoleum and Picture Gallery, 156
- Edelstein, Mel (J.M.), 117, 118
 Eisenhower, Dwight D., 23
 Eisenman, Peter, 151-152
 Englander, Nancy, 37, 38-40, 42, 61, 63, 64, 65, 83-84, 86, 129, 138, 162, 172-174, 180
 Ester, Michael, 139-140
- Feinstein, Estelle, 21-22
 Feynman, Richard, 161
 Fink, Eleanor, 137, 140-141
 Fleischman, Barbara and Lawrence, 108-109
 Forster, Kurt, 64, 73-74, 75-76, 77, 78, 80, 117, 119, 120, 122-123, 124-125, 146
 Forster-Hahn, Françoise, 76
 Fowler Museum of Cultural History, 105
 Fredericksen, Burton, 42
 Frel, Jiří, 111-112
- Gardner, John, 30
 Garrett, Stephen, 41
 Gauguin, Paul, 98-99, 113
 Gehry, Frank, 151-152
 Getty, Gordon, 43-46, 48, 49-50, 58
 Getty, J. Paul, 31, 89-90, 101, 114
 Getty, Ronald, 60
 Getty Conservation Institute, 67-70, 128-137, 138, 178-179, 180, 187



Getty Education Institute, 63, 70–72,
83, 137, 157–161

Getty Grant Program, 135, 162–165,
177, 178, 179

Getty Information Institute, 80,
137–141, 167

Getty Kouros, 60, 101–103

Getty Leadership Institute, 166–167

Getty Research Institute for the
History of Art and the
Humanities, 70, 73, 79–80, 82,
115–123, 124–128, 146–147,
155, 175, 178, 180, 188

Getty Villa, 110

Giambologna, 42, 56, 92

Giurgola, Ronaldo, 150

Gogh, Vincent van, 95, 96, 98

Goldner, George, 41–42, 107

Gombrich, Ernst (E.H.), 65

Gordon, Slate, 186

Grabar, Oleg, 65

Grant, J.A.C., 7

Hale, John, 65

Hanks, Nancy, 34, 37–38, 185–186

Hannah, Dick, 24

Herzog August Bibliothek, 156

Hoving, Thomas, 175

Hurley, Jim, 20

Hymans, Herbert, 119

International Repertory of the

Literature of Art (RILA), 138

Institute for Advanced Study, 66

Irwin, Robert, 148

Jagiellonian University, 178

Johnson, Lyndon B., 24

J. Paul Getty Museum, 31, 34, 35, 37,
40–42, 46, 50, 68, 82, 84, 89–96,
97–101, 108–109, 111, 113–114,
136, 146–147, 154, 178

Kahn, Fred, 170

Kearns, Joseph, 77

Kennedy, John F., 23–24

Kennedy, Robert, 24, 27, 28

Kohl, Helmut, 176–177

Korean War, 13–16, 17

Kren, Thom, 92

Lacy, Bill, 86

Landais, Hubert, 65, 73

Lang, Jack, 101

Lavin, Irving, 64, 65, 73

Levy, Leon, 109

Lipton, Marty, 44, 45, 49

Los Angeles County Museum of Art
(LACMA), 98, 143, 181–182

Mack, Mark, 150

Maki, Fumihiko, 145, 149

Marrow, Deborah, 162–164, 174, 180

McGovern, George, 25

Meier, Richard, 145–146, 147–148,
149, 150–151, 152, 153

Metzenbaum, Howard, 169–170

Meyers, Jack, 164

Miller, Robert, 43, 44

Millon, Henry A., 75

Monet, Claude, 100

Monreal, Luis, 128–130, 131,
133–134

Murphy, Franklin, 30–31, 57, 58,
63–64

Naef, Weston, 107



- National Endowment for the Arts
(NEA), 34, 183–186
- National Endowment for the
Humanities (NEH), 38
- Nixon, Richard M., 25
- Norton Simon Museum of Art, 90,
104–105, 162
- Onians, John, 125
- Organization for Economic
Cooperation and Development
(OECD), 26
- Panofsky, Erwin, 127
- Peeler, Stuart, 47
- Pei, I.M., 149
- Petersen, Sidney, 43, 44
- Pontormo, Jacopo, 98
- Poussin, Nicolas, 34
- Powell, Lawrence Clark, 118
- Public Policy Institute of California,
168
- Reagan, Ronald, 25, 171
- Reese, Tom, 119, 125, 146, 179, 180
- Rich, Andrea, 181
- Riordan, Richard, 27
- Roosevelt, Jimmy, 23
- Roth, Michael, 122
- Rountree, Stephen, 37, 41, 174
- Rusk, Marianne, 174
- Sanday, John, 135
- Santa Monica Museum of Art, 164
- Sauerländer, Willibald, 65, 73, 74, 127
- Schine, David, 85
- Securities and Exchange Commission
(SEC), 25, 28, 31–33, 39, 55,
168–169
- Seibel, Elmar, 118–119
- Settis, Salvatore, 117, 120, 121,
125–126
- Shareholder Rights Bill, 169–170
- Simon, Norton, 16, 19–21, 34, 54,
106–107, 123
- Slive, Seymour, 65, 73
- Smyth, Craig Hugh, 73
- Soane, John, 156
- Stevenson, Adlai, 23
- Stirling, James, 145, 149
- Sullivan Louis, 144
- Thuillier, Jacques, 65
- Toll, Maynard J., 12
- True, Marion, 108, 109–110, 136
- Truman, Harry, 23, 28
- University of California, Los Angeles
(UCLA), 5–8, 9, 25, 29, 33, 54,
78, 87–88, 105–106, 118, 119,
143, 166, 171
- Venturi, Robert, 149, 150
- Vospers, Bob, 119
- Walden, Gwen, 174
- Wallace, Henry, 23, 28
- Walsh, John, 35, 37, 82, 90, 91, 92,
98, 110–111
- Warburg Institute, 65, 126
- Whalen, Tim, 164
- Whaley, J. Patrick, 47
- White, Shelby, 109
- Williams, Louis (father), 1, 3–4, 9
- Williams, Sophie (mother), 1, 3–5
- Wittmann, Otto, 35, 42, 63
- Zeri, Federico, 35, 60









215 North Fifth Avenue
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48104

